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INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

Sinclair Community College is a public, nonprofit, comprehensive, non-residential community college based in downtown Dayton, Ohio, that is authorized by Section 3354.02 of the Ohio Revised Code to provide higher education opportunities for citizens of Montgomery County, Warren County, and the surrounding Miami Valley region of southwest Ohio. Sinclair has served the region since David A. Sinclair, then Director of the Dayton YMCA, founded a course of evening adult training classes in 1887 to meet the needs of employers and to provide opportunities for the undereducated and unemployed men who were drawn to the Dayton area by an emerging manufacturing economy. David Sinclair’s frequent admonition to “Find the need and endeavor to meet it” became the credo of the community college that bears his name.

Sinclair College serves some 32,000 unduplicated college credit students annually, 10,000 non-credit students, and 100,000 conference center attendees. The college operates with a $125 million annual operating budget from a Dayton, Ohio, headquarters valued at $550 million in physical plant replacement value.

Sinclair College maintains operations within a four-part strategic focus: (1) continuous improvement in student learning and support systems, (2) student and community accessibility to college services, (3) college service aligned with community needs, and (4) organizational sustainability.

As Sinclair approaches its 130th year of continuous operations, there is a number of notable Sinclair characteristics and exemplars. Sinclair is or touts:

- Among the 5% largest community colleges in the nation, with extraordinary numbers and levels of programs and services
- A very active national partner with national foundations, institutes, associations and U.S. departments and agencies for the purpose of improving student success
- One of 20 Board Member Colleges of the League for Innovation in the Community College
- The lowest tuition rate in Ohio for the vast majority of students
- New cutting edge workforce programs like unmanned aerial systems, cyber security, and competency based education in IT
- Very large numbers of nationally recognized and honored students, faculty, administrators and trustees
- Very high community approval and quality assessment ratings
- No financial debt, minimal deferred maintenance, and ample strategic financial reserves allocated to future needs
- Extremely well developed K-12 partnership programs connecting Sinclair to dozens of school districts, early colleges, dropout recovery charter schools, dual enrollment, and academic enrichment (all serving thousands of school children)
- One of the nation’s finest community conference centers, hosting hundreds of community events annually for business, trade, cultural, civic, and educational support

Sinclair is passionate about improving student success, and will continue into the future to aggressively reform student support and learning systems to increase student success. Sinclair is proud to have one of Ohio’s highest market penetration rates (high numbers of the overall community population is enrolled at Sinclair), and has high numbers of school partnership programs to facilitate higher levels of college going rates. Success in improving college certificate and degrees attainment is being realized and momentum is building.

Sinclair’s Mission Statement, adopted in 1997, exemplifies the institution’s focus on helping area residents achieve their dreams through post-secondary education.

FIGURE 0.1
SINCLAIR MISSION STATEMENT

We help individuals turn dreams into achievable goals through accessible, high quality, affordable learning opportunities.

Our mission is guided by our commitment to:

- Offer transfer and technical associate degree programs, certificate programs, and continuing education opportunities through a system of diverse resources and delivery alternatives accessible to the citizens of Montgomery County and the larger learning community.
- Provide quality instruction, educational activities, counseling, support services, and assessment tools to facilitate the growth and development of lifelong learners and to assist individuals to achieve personal and professional goals.
- Prepare today’s workforce to meet the needs of a rapidly changing, technologically advanced, global economy through traditional and nontraditional alternatives.
- Challenge individuals to broaden their concepts of self, expand their views of the world, and recognize their roles in a global society by fostering values that respect and celebrate diversity while promoting social responsibility, critical thinking, communication, and innovation.
- Promote the development and implementation of new ideas, provide leadership for collaborative activities, and serve as a resource center for community-based and regional partnerships.
- Manage our human physical and financial resources in a caring, ethical, and prudent way that facilitates a working and learning environment focused on continuous improvement.
Sinclair’s vision statement, adopted in 1994, emphasizes the institution’s commitment to access for students from diverse backgrounds, a high quality learning environment, and community support.

In recent years overall headcount at Sinclair has totaled between 20,000 and 26,000 unique students each fall term. Figure O.3 provides the most recent information on number and demographics of students, faculty, and staff at Sinclair:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49% male</td>
<td>64% white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% female</td>
<td>16% black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13% no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% male</td>
<td>85% white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% female</td>
<td>11% black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47% male</td>
<td>79% white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% female</td>
<td>18% black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL-TIME / PART-TIME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>25% less than 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% full-time</td>
<td>39% 20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% part-time</td>
<td>14% 30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% 40 and over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% full-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73% part-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% full-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47% part-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Sinclair maintains a steadfast commitment to the City of Dayton and its downtown campus location, students may also attend classes in several other locations, including the Englewood Learning Center, the Huber Heights Learning Center, the Preble County Learning Center, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and the Courseview Campus Center in Warren County. Figure O.4 displays a map of the various Sinclair locations in southwest Ohio. Additionally, online learning programs and courses have come to serve an increasing number of students in recent years.

Over a 35 year period, Sinclair has progressed from offering videotaped courses that enrolled around 50 students total to offering 180 different online courses to approximately 6,000 students each term. Sinclair currently offers 9 associate degrees, 2 online one-year certificates, and 6 short-term certificates that can be earned completely online. Academic programs for credit are offered through the four academic divisions:

- Business and Public Services
- Health Sciences
- Liberal Arts, Communication, and Social Sciences
- Science, Mathematics, and Engineering.

Key credit programs for the College include career (applied degrees, technical certificates) and transfer programs. Sinclair currently offers more than 200 different degree and certificate programs, as shown by the categories in Figure O.5.

In addition to academic program offerings, key continuing education programming is offered by the Workforce Development and Corporate Services division, which offers an array of training classes, programs, consulting, and other services. The non-credit programs offered include management development, process improvement, healthcare, manufacturing, information technology, and acquisition.

Much has changed regarding Sinclair’s continuous improvement efforts since the last AQIP Systems Portfolio. In that time three AQIP action projects have been closed, and three new ones have begun. Figure O.6 displays AQIP Action Projects that have been closed and initiated during that period.

Since the last Systems Portfolio, Sinclair has received several high-profile grants to improve student learning that have enhanced our continuous improvement efforts considerably. These initiatives mark the beginning of an era in which Sinclair will seek to enhance and expand its already substantial efforts to help more students attain the knowledge and credentials they arrive at our institution intending to pursue. It is noteworthy that all our high-profile grants involve significant collaboration within and beyond the College. These initiatives come at an ideal time given the state of Ohio’s recent transition to Performance Based Funding, with all state funding of higher education now dependent on student performance. While increasing student success has always been a high priority at Sinclair, the combination of new grant-funded initiatives and Performance Based Funding have given Sinclair an even sharper focus on this goal.

With its rich heritage of more than 128 years of experience in helping southwest Ohio residents attain their education goals, Sinclair Community College is ideally positioned to help students from the surrounding communities achieve their educational aspirations. This heritage forms a solid foundation from which Sinclair can strategically look ahead to help prepare its students to meet the local, national, and global challenges of an ever-changing world.
### Number of Program Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Parallel Programs (AA &amp; AS)</td>
<td>First two years of a baccalaureate degree for students planning to transfer to a four-year institution.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Programs (AAS)</td>
<td>Career and Technical Programs prepare students for employment upon graduation.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Programs (CRT)</td>
<td>One-half of an associate degree, consisting of 45 - 55 credit hours.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Certificates (STC)</td>
<td>Designed for a specific employment situation, consisting of fewer than 45 credit hours.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Program (AIS, ATS)</td>
<td>Individually planned technical or general course of study designed to meet the needs of the students not served through another degree program.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Goal</th>
<th>Project Kickoff</th>
<th>Project Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance Evaluation System</td>
<td>The goal of this project was to design a new on-line performance evaluation system that would promote consistency and simplicity for evaluators and those employees being evaluated. The system consists of components that measure actual job performance, outcomes, and performance development and professional growth.</td>
<td>10-30-09</td>
<td>05-01-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the First Year Student Experience</td>
<td>Through this action project, related but often disconnected college systems and programs were studied that have direct effects on the success of entering students. Current resources and practices were improved and integrated to increase new student engagement and support services for entering students.</td>
<td>01-01-11</td>
<td>05-01-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Retention and Success</td>
<td>The goal of this project was to: Identify factors that impact student success and retention in select Sinclair developmental math courses (DEV 084, DEV085, DEV 108, and MAT 101); Target selected factors and define intervention strategies to improve student success; Implement intervention strategies; Assess the impact of new strategies on student success; Operationalize successful intervention strategies</td>
<td>02-06-06</td>
<td>11-29-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Initiated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Goal</th>
<th>Project Kickoff</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building a Holistic Advising System</td>
<td>The goal is to identify and implement a holistic advising system to address students’ academic, personal, career and financial needs.</td>
<td>12-17-13</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting an Institutional Policy Review with a Completion Focus</td>
<td>The primary goals of this Action Project include:</td>
<td>12-01-12</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify institutional policies that promote and encourage student completion of credentials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify institutional policies that are barriers to student completion of credentials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion</td>
<td>This project aims to enhance coordination and cohesion between various college systems to better facilitate student enrollment and completion by accomplishing the following:</td>
<td>12-17-13</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinate and align our planning and scheduling of course and section offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhance the monitoring and management of course section availability through the enrollment cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve efficiency and lower the cost of our course offerings by increasing average class size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better ensure the availability of new offerings as course sections reach capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve our ability to meet our students’ course scheduling needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporate consideration of new state performance-based funding into our enrollment and scheduling/planning processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

CATEGORY INTRODUCTION

Sinclair Community College has been involved in General Education assessment in its academic programs since the mid-1990s, when its General Education Committee first created the six common learning outcomes for the College, known as “General Education outcomes.” These six outcomes specify skills and abilities that all Sinclair graduates are expected to master prior to graduation, and that are infused throughout the curriculum.

The Assessment Committee recently adjusted the six General Education outcomes to better meet industry and transfer expectations, and improve measurability for assessment purposes. Each academic department assesses General Education outcomes and regularly reports the results – along with any changes planned due to the results – yearly in an Annual Update, with an extensive summary every five years through a Program Review self-study.

Sinclair also has a well-established, mature structure for program outcomes assessment. By college requirement, all academic degrees and certificates include at least three program outcomes linked to specific courses in the curriculum to ensure regular program outcomes assessment.

Sinclair tracks the needs of various stakeholder groups closely in a variety of ways, notably through its office of Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR). The College routinely uses this stakeholder group tracking data to address the changing needs.

Sinclair’s approach to program design, development and modification to meet stakeholder needs is data-informed, systematic, and strategic. Well-established, formalized curriculum processes allow for efficient proposal and review of new programs that are developed to meet emerging stakeholder needs. All applied degree programs utilize advisory groups to help inform efforts to meet emerging community needs, and a solid Program Review/Annual Update process ensures that academic departments regularly examine their program offerings.

Because it is an open enrollment institution, Sinclair admits students at varying levels of preparation for college. As a result, the College uses placement testing to determine whether students need developmental coursework, and if so the level and amount of remedial education needed. In addition to the institution-wide expectations for student preparation, some individual programs also have expectations, prerequisites, and minimum standards that must be achieved prior to entry. All such expectations are communicated to students and prospective students via the college website, the course catalog, and individual program-specific webpages.

Sinclair sets high expectations for consistency in course offerings regardless of location or modality. The same Master Syllabus – containing uniform course outcomes and course outline - applies to all sections of a course taught in any form or through any delivery method. This same level of consistency and rigor is applied to prior learning and incoming transfer credits – Sinclair has robust processes in place to ensure the quality and applicability of credits and creditable experiences that students bring with them to the institution.

In recent years, Sinclair has invested substantial resources in improving support services to at-risk students. Innovative approaches have been developed to help at-risk students move more quickly through developmental education. Another support for at-risk and other students is My Academic Plan (MAP), which Academic Advisors use to help students plan out coursework in the coming semesters leading to a degree or certificate. Sinclair has a multitude of learning support services available to all students, at-risk or otherwise.

In recent years, the College has made changes to student support services as a result of participation in major change initiatives funded by external partners. Completion by Design, Connect 4 Completion, the Developmental Education Initiative (DEI), and several other grant funded initiatives have involved changes to many Sinclair services, particularly Academic Advising. A major aspect of improvement efforts at the College over the next one to three years will target increasing completion rates for students through these initiatives.

Sinclair Community College is committed to an educational environment that encourages and supports academic freedom among faculty and academic integrity for students, and has longstanding policies in place to support these vital components of higher education. In addition, the Faculty Handbook (www.sinclair.edu/about/pub/faculty_handbook.pdf) spells out the clear standards for faculty integrity in academic endeavors and professional involvements. Faculty and administration work side-by-side to establish these standards and revise them as the need arises.

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF PROCESSES FOR CATEGORY 1: INTEGRATED

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF RESULTS FOR CATEGORY 1: INTEGRATED
Common Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. Describe the processes for determining, communicating, and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Aligning common outcomes to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution (Core component 3.B.1, 3.E.2)

Sinclair’s faculty and staff developed the initial common learning outcomes as the College evaluated and reinvented its approach to General Education in the mid-1990s. Development of these “General Education outcomes,” incorporated input from students, faculty, and a General Education Community Advisory Group composed of both internal and external stakeholders. Created with Sinclair’s mission in mind, the outcomes focused on an appropriate level for community college students. Sinclair’s mission statement explicitly states that we will “challenge individuals to broaden their concepts of self, expand their views of the world, and recognize their roles in a global society by fostering values that respect and celebrate diversity while promoting social responsibility, critical thinking, communication, and innovation” and “prepare today’s workforce to meet the needs of a rapidly changing, technologically advanced, global economy through traditional and nontraditional alternatives” – our common learning outcomes (designated institutionally as General Education outcomes) were designed to align with these specific aspects of our mission statement (addresses Core component 3.B.1).

As will be discussed in subsequent sections, data regarding achievement of these outcomes at both the program and institutional level is made available on the Sinclair website in Annual Update reports and Program Review self-studies, providing evidence that Sinclair is meeting the outcomes focused on an appropriate level for community college students. Sinclair’s General Education Vision Statement that guided the development of the outcomes states that:

We believe in unlimited human potential. General Education is a process whereby lifelong learners grow and fulfill that potential. General Education supports individuals in the quest to become whole, complete persons by encouraging development in areas such as thought, communication, values, creativity, feeling, adaptability and awareness. General Education provides foundation skills necessary for successful living in the ever-changing present and future global environment. In addition to encouraging uniqueness and personal development, General Education provides the commonalities which enable us to collaborate and achieve community. Indeed, as we face the challenges inherent in human existence, General Education is a key to solving the problems of survival for individuals, communities, nations and the species. (addresses Core component 3.B.2).

The six institutional General Education outcomes that emerged from this process are listed in Figure 1.1. Each of these has additional subheadings that further articulate these outcomes, an example of which can be seen in Figure 1.2. Sinclair has had the same basic six General Education outcomes throughout the past 15 years, although the Assessment Committee completed extensive revisions to the components of these General Education outcomes that were recently approved by Instructional Council.

Within the past few years, the Assessment Committee reviewed the Computer Literacy General Education outcome and competencies to keep pace with technology skills required by employers of Sinclair graduates. A faculty-led subgroup of the Assessment Committee spent a year drafting a new version with input from students, faculty, and other stakeholders, including employers. The revisions received full approval from the Assessment Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and finally Instructional Council in Spring 2014. Figure 1.2 shows the updates to the definition and subheading competencies of the Computer Literacy outcome.
### COMPETENCIES ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>General Education Rubrics Prepared for Use by Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Literacy: the ability to apply concepts and terminology in the basic operation of computers.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/CompLit.docx">www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/CompLit.docx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving: the application of higher order analytical and creative cognitive processes.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/CritThink.doc">www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/CritThink.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy: the ability to effectively locate, evaluate, and use information.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/InfoLit.docx">www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/InfoLit.docx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication: the creation of common understanding through the use of verbal and nonverbal messages in a variety of contexts.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/OralCom.docx">www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/OralCom.docx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values/Citizenship/Community: an awareness of personal obligations and responsibilities in one’s community of influence.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/Values.docx">www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/Values.docx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication: the creation of understanding through composition and synthesis of the written word.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/Written.docx">www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/pub/Written.docx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 1.1

**SINCLAIR’S GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES**

Not only do faculty take the lead in the development and maintenance of the General Education outcomes, they also lead assessment of these outcomes. Sinclair subscribes to the HLC statement that “faculty members...should have the fundamental role in development and sustaining systematic assessment of student learning” (see the HLC “Commission Statement on Assessment of Student Learning”). With the exception of one member from the Provost’s Office and one member from RAR, the Assessment Committee is composed entirely of faculty. In addition, the chair of the committee must be a faculty member per Faculty Handbook guidelines, and according to the Handbook “only faculty representatives from each academic division are eligible to vote and chair all subcommittees.” Furthermore, the College charges the academic departments with General Education assessment, and within their departments it is faculty who must demonstrate that assessment is occurring on an ongoing basis through the Annual Update and Program Review processes. Faculty experts called Divisional Assessment Coordinators (one per academic division) receive release time as a divisional resource for assessment-related knowledge and to monitor and strengthen assessment practices. These Divisional Assessment Coordinators review all Annual Update submissions prior to submission to the Provost’s Office, and provide feedback to faculty regarding how to align their assessment work with best practices in assessment (addresses Core component 4.B.4).

- **Articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement of the outcomes (Core component 3.B.2, 4.B.1)**
- **Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (Core component 3.B.3, 3.B.5)**

By design, Sinclair infused the General Education outcomes throughout the curriculum. Every course that Sinclair offers must relate to at least one of the General Education outcomes, and every program that Sinclair offers must ensure that students achieve each of the General Education outcomes at some point in the program curriculum (addresses Core component 3.B.2). No student completes a degree program at Sinclair without all General Education outcomes being addressed in the curriculum, including the critical thinking and information literacy skills students need to master modes of inquiry to collect and analyze information, the oral and written communication skills students need to communicate information, and the appreciation for values, citizenship, and community that will allow them to adapt to a changing global environment (see Figure 1.1) (addresses Core components 3.B.3 and 3.B.5). The connections with General Education in courses and programs are "built in" at the time the curriculum is developed, and the department developing the course or program is responsible for specifying...
For each degree or certificate program that Sinclair offers, General Education outcomes can be linked to courses in the curriculum to demonstrate where they are addressed and at what level in the program. Figure 1.4 provides an example illustrating how Oral Communication is addressed in the Accounting degree program at Sinclair. Similar reports can be generated for all General Education outcomes within all academic programs (addresses Core component 4.B.1).

- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs (Core component 3.B.4)

The Assessment Committee is charged with ensuring that the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with stakeholder needs. As noted previously, the Committee recently revised the Computer Literacy outcome to remain relevant to student and employer needs. Similarly, Committee recognized that the Values, Citizenship, and Community General Education outcome did not address diversity and global interconnectedness at the necessary level. Consequently, the Assessment Committee undertook revision and sought eventual approval of this outcome revision. The outcome has recently been renamed to Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship, defined as "Apply knowledge of cultural diversity to real world context by acknowledging, understanding, and engaging constructively within the contemporary world" (addresses Core component 3.B.4).

The committee is revisiting the other outcomes, although not revising them to the same extent, for measurability at the competency subheading level. As the College converts to a new Learning Management System (LMS), additional direct assessment options will aid in the direct assessment of General Education outcomes student achievement. The current General Education rubrics can be reviewed at www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/gened/genedrubrics.

- Designing, aligning, and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning (Core component 3.E.1, 4.B.2)

Service Learning offerings supply the strongest examples of co-curricular activities that support General Education and learning in general at Sinclair. Through the support of a Coordinator of Service Learning based out of the College’s Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the College
recruits and trains faculty to engage students for this purpose. Sinclair defines Service Learning as follows: “Service Learning at Sinclair is an educational strategy intentionally designed by faculty to engage students in course-related learning while meeting community needs” (addresses Core component 3.E.1). Recognizing that students can gain valuable hands-on experience that enhances in-class learning while at the same time providing needed services to the community, the Sinclair Service Learning motto encourages students to “Engage Your Mind – Serve Your Community – Change the World – Be the Difference.” Figure 1.5 provides data on the number of students participating in Service Learning at Sinclair since 2008.

Service Learning participation has grown substantially since 2008, and the impact on students who participate is significant. In 2013, the College developed an online survey to capture student feedback. Results from this survey, shared in 1R1, provide evidence that students’ Service Learning experiences help them better connect to in-class learning, improved relationships with students and faculty, and increased understanding of challenges that other groups face. The results of this survey are consistent with previous surveys administered by the Service Learning office, indicating that students find service learning a positive influence on their academic experience and career decision making (addresses Core component 4.B.2). Additional information regarding Sinclair’s Service Learning opportunities can be found at www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/slearning.

Student clubs represent another opportunity for co-curricular learning. All student clubs have a faculty advisor to ensure strong connections with Instruction. The list below is a sample of some of the student organizations available to students on campus:

- Phi Theta Kappa (www.sinclair.edu/organizations/ptk/index.cfm)
- Sinclair Ohio Fellows Leadership Development Program (www.sinclair.edu/organizations/fellows/index.cfm)
- African-American Men of the Future (www.sinclair.edu/organizations/aamfc/index.cfm)
- Brite Signal Alliance (www.sinclair.edu/organizations/bsa/index.cfm)

A more extensive list of campus organizations can be found at www.sinclair.edu/organizations/.

Other co-curricular learning opportunities include campus theatre productions, musical performances, The Clarion, the campus newspaper, and student athletics, all of which provide opportunities for practical experience with material that is learned in class.

- Selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (Core component 4.B.2)

- Assessing common learning outcomes (Core component 4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

Sinclair currently takes three approaches to assessment of common learning outcomes. One is a decentralized approach that is conducted by individual departments and reported in Program Review and Annual Update submissions conducted for the institution as a whole. The second is a centralized, institution-wide assessment involving student self-ratings on General Education outcomes in a campus-wide survey. Finally, Sinclair asks graduate employers to provide feedback on student performance related to several General Education outcomes. The first, decentralized approach requires faculty in each department to assess General Education outcomes in a manner best suited to the area of study and the required student assignments (addresses Core component 4.B.4). Each year the College selects one or more General Education outcomes for all academic departments on campus to assess, and the departments report results in the Annual Update submission to the Provost’s Office. In addition, departmental General Education outcome assessment is summarized and discussed in depth every five years in the department’s Program Review (a description of the Annual Update and Program Review processes at Sinclair can be found in section 1P3). Through the requisite General Education reports, Annual Updates and Program Review, Sinclair guarantees that each academic department assesses these common learning outcomes regularly (addresses Core component 4.B.1). Moreover, the Annual Update and is structured to encourage them to contemplation of how to use the resultant data to improve student learning. Figure 1.6 displays the questions on the Annual Update template.
regarding use of results of General Education outcome assessment to improve student learning (addresses Core component 4.B.3).

The second approach involving Sinclair’s Current Student Survey is a centralized, campus-wide self-report assessment of student achievement of General Education outcomes. The Current Student Survey is administered in both Fall and Spring terms to a representative sample of sections. Since 2005-06, General Education skill self-assessment has been included in the Current Student Survey, with each General Education outcome being reviewed every three years. **Figure 1.9** in section 1R1 displays a general summary of results in recent years from these surveys (addresses Core component 4.B.2). Beginning in Spring 2014, questions targeting each of the General Education outcomes will be included with every survey, and an attempt will be made to determine whether ratings differ depending on how long students have been at Sinclair and whether students become more confident in these areas as they progress in their education. Internship surveys to employers also capture General Education data based on work supervisor input. However, these latter efforts have just begun, and no analysis of these results is yet available.

Finally, Sinclair conducts an annual Employer Survey. As part of this survey, Sinclair asks employers to rate Sinclair graduates on Critical Thinking and Communication, which relate to the Critical Thinking/Problem Solving, Oral Communication, and Written Communication General Education outcomes (addresses Core component 4.B.2).

What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are expected at each degree level?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)

As mentioned in section 1P1, at present General Education outcomes at Sinclair are assessed in the following ways:

- As part of the Annual Update reports departments are required to submit to their division dean and to the Provost’s Office each year, one or two General Education outcomes are selected, and all departments are asked to report assessment results for the outcome(s). **Figure 1.7** displays the schedule for the next few years for departmental assessment of General Education outcomes in association with the Annual Update process.

Furthermore, in each five-year Program Review self-study departments present evidence of General Education assessment and describe how that assessment work has been used to identify changes that will increase student learning. In these efforts, departments choose any assessment method that is appropriate to their courses and programs. This approach ensures that every department is assessing General Education outcomes, and encourages departments to use that data to improve their courses and programs. **Figure 1.8** provides some examples of General Education assessment work reported by four different departments in their Annual Update submissions. All departments must submit similar results in their Annual Updates to document that they are assessing General Education outcomes. All academic department results for General Education assessment can be found in the Annual Updates and Program Review self-studies available via this link: [www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/pdreview](http://www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/pdreview).

- In addition, as described in section 1P1, as part of the college’s annual Current Student Survey, students are asked to rate themselves on each of the General Education outcomes. Sinclair has recently begun analyzing results taking into account the length of time that students have been enrolled at the college to determine whether students who have been enrolled for longer have higher self-ratings on General Education outcomes, although these results are not yet available. **Figure 1.9** displays the available results from these student self-ratings from the most recent administration for which data is available.

While student self-ratings can be an important source of data, Sinclair recognizes the limitations of using self-reports to assess achievement of the General Education outcomes. Internship employer data and graduate employer feedback also help to inform the results and focus improvements. The Assessment Committee will focus many of its activities in Academic Year 2014-15 on developing the processes necessary to further embed direct measures of assessment into the new LMS.

- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks

As was noted previously, employers provide feedback on the achievement of General Education outcomes by the Sinclair graduates that they hire. Every year Sinclair conducts a survey of employers of our graduates six months subsequent to graduation, and one part of the survey asks...
### SECTION III: ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION & DEGREE PROGRAM OUTCOMES

The Program Outcomes for the degrees listed below. All program outcomes must be assessed at least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Outcomes</th>
<th>To which degree(s) is this program outcome related?</th>
<th>Year assessed or to be assessed</th>
<th>Assessment Methods Listed</th>
<th>What are the assessment results? (please provide brief summary data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>The Mystery Shopper paper is assigned to teams of 4 or 5 students. Students use information from lessons learned throughout the course to develop and deliver a Mystery Shopper project. The project is evaluated based on a pre-established rubric. Class average scores greater than 80% are considered proficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1.8

HELPING STUDENTS LEARN FROM ANNUAL EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT REPORTING

- **Problem Solving**: 37% above Competent or Expert Performance
- **Critical Thinking program**: 45% Competent to Perform Independently
- **Empirical Reasoning**: 18% rated below Competent to Perform Independently

### Program Item Average - 92.6% (n=397)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Item</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy People 2020 Project Rubric</td>
<td>92.6% (n=397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESI Report for 2012-13 AY Capstone Student performance in eight (8) categories related to critical thinking</td>
<td>94.7% (n=92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Satisfaction Survey on Critical Thinking program outcome. (n=23)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction Survey on Critical Thinking program outcome. (n=41)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Program item Average**: 92.6% (n=397)
- **1st Year Average**: 94.7% (n=92)
- **2nd Year Average**: 91% (n=305)

### Program Assessment Results

- **HESI**: 810 (range 762-846)
- **NAT ADN 847**
- **Shopper Paper**: Average Grade for Mystery Shop paper
- **BIS 1400.226 SU13**: 15.03/25 (68%)
- **BIS 1400.333 FA12**: 16.04/25 (65%)
- **BIS 1400.333 FA12**: 14.06/25 (56%)

### Interpretation of results and insights gained

On the whole, students’ self-ratings indicate confidence in their skills related to General Education outcomes, as can be seen in Figure 1.9. Generally departments report high levels of achievement of General Education outcomes in their Annual Update submissions to the Provost’s Office. Figure 1.10 provides external evidence from employers that our students are achieving these outcomes.
FIGURE 1.9
EXAMPLE OF
RESULTS FROM
STUDENT
SELF-RATINGS
OF GENERAL
EDUCATION
MASTERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCIES</th>
<th>CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication Skills</td>
<td>Approximately three-quarters of respondents rated their written communication skills as very good or good across all skills measured in the Current Student Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication Skills</td>
<td>Between three-quarters and four-fifths of respondents rated their oral communication skills as very good or good across most skills measured in the Current Student Survey. The lone exception was speech composition and delivery, for which just over half of respondents rated their abilities as very good or good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving</td>
<td>Approximately three-quarters of respondents rated their critical thinking and problem solving skills as very good or good across most skills measured in the Current Student Survey. Exceptions included the ability to ask relevant questions and the ability to use logic in defending an argument, for which just over four-fifths of respondents rated their abilities as very good or good, and the ability to identify complex patterns across multiple sources, for which just over two-thirds of respondents rated their abilities as very good or good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1.10
EMPLOYER RATINGS OF SINCLAIR GRADUATES ON GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL DIMENSION</th>
<th>PERCENT WHO Assigned a Rating of “Very Good” or “Good”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Related Conceptual Knowledge</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Related Technical Knowledge</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Attitude/Professionalism</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Quality</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Think Logically</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Abilities</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication Skills</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication Skills</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Skills</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Gathering Skills</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Preparation</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Employer Survey (survey years 2007 through 2014)

FIGURE 1.11
RESULTS FROM THE 2014 SERVICE LEARNING SURVEY

Responses to Service Learning Student Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing this service project helped me better connect to what I am learning in my class</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing this service project improved my relationship with my classmates and/or instructor</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Service Learning experience increased my understanding of problems or challenges other people or groups face in society</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every student should have to do a Service Learning project in order to graduate</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on 1R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Sinclair has long engaged in assessment of its General Education outcomes, relying on a structure where these outcomes have been built into all of the courses and programs we offer. We hope to augment the existing assessment work that includes department level assessment, student self-ratings, and employer ratings with institutional-level direct assessment of these outcomes. Within the next three years it is hoped that the assessment features of the new LMS will be utilized to increase the robustness of Sinclair's General Education assessment considerably. As part of this effort, the following steps have either already been taken or are currently underway:

- Purchase of tools associated with the new LMS that will allow for direct assessment of artifacts placed in dropboxes in the LMS that provide students the opportunity to display mastery of General Education outcomes.
- Revision of existing General Education outcome rubrics to allow for better measurement of whether or not there is evidence that the outcome has been achieved. In view of taking the most efficient approach possible, the rubrics are being developed to indicate presence or absence of evidence for achievement of the outcome.

The following steps will need to be taken in the future in order for this initiative to be a success:

- Assignments that can be used as evidence for achievement of General Education outcomes will need to be identified, preferably in capstone courses and other courses late in a program where students should have mastered General Education competencies. Identification of courses where mastery of General Education outcomes is achieved in programs is occurring via the 2014-15 Annual Update process, and as part of this effort departments are being asked to identify and/or develop exams, assignments, activities, quizzes or other artifacts that could be used as evidence of achievement of general education outcomes.
- A review process of some kind will need to be developed to review these artifacts and determine whether the outcome has been achieved
- Access to the tool will need to be provided for reviewers
- Reporting mechanisms will need to be established, and a structure for review of the data and its use for continuous improvement will need to be developed.

According to the Sinclair Mission statement, among other things Sinclair’s mission is guided by a commitment to:

- Offer transfer and technical associate degree programs, certificate programs, and continuing education opportunities through a system of diverse resources and delivery alternatives accessible to the citizens of Montgomery County and the larger learning community.
- Provide quality instruction, educational activities, counseling, support services, and assessment tools to facilitate the growth and development of lifelong learners and to assist individuals to achieve personal and professional goals.

In support of the commitments that Sinclair makes in these excerpts from the Sinclair Mission statement, every degree or certificate program must have at least three program outcomes. The Provost’s Office and Assessment Coordinators ensure that each academic program has appropriate and measurable outcomes. Assessment of these outcomes is required and documents that students achieve the outcomes by the time they graduate – and by extension that the institution is fulfilling its mission as stated in the bullet points above (addresses Core component 3.E.2).

- Determining program outcomes (Core component 4.B.4)

Faculty are responsible for curriculum development at Sinclair, and this includes the development of at least three program outcomes for each academic program we offer. During the process of semester conversion Divisional Assessment Coordinators and Provost Office personnel verified that all existing programs had outcomes that were appropriate, well-written, and measureable. When program outcomes required improvement, the Divisional Assessment Coordinators worked with departments until these outcomes were brought to a high standard of appropriateness and measurability. As new programs are proposed, department faculty develop outcomes for the new program as they enter the program proposal into the Curriculum Management Tool (CMT), the electronic tool that Sinclair has developed for curriculum development, review and maintenance. Once the proposed program is entered into CMT, the Divisional Deans and the Manager of Curriculum, Articulation, and Transfer review the
outcomes and provide feedback and guidance as necessary. The Curriculum Review Committee further reviews the program outcomes as the proposed program makes its way through Sinclair’s curriculum approval process. As a result of this process, faculty determine program outcomes with formative feedback from the Dean, the Provost’s Office, the Curriculum Review Committee and in some cases the Divisional Assessment Coordinator (addresses Core component 4.B.4).

• Articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement of the outcomes (Core component 4.B.1)

• Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs (Core component 3.B.4)

While the Provost’s Office provides guidance and feedback on developing program outcomes, it is faculty who develop the outcomes and specify the purpose, content, and level of achievement for the outcomes at the time they are entered into CMT. Figure 1.12 provides an example of the program outcomes for one of Sinclair’s associate degree programs. All of Sinclair’s academic programs, whether degree or certificate programs, are required to have at least three program outcomes.

Faculty develop the program outcomes and ensure relevancy and alignment with community needs. When department faculty determine outcomes require revision or rewrite, the faculty member submits a program revision through CMT and the previously described review process commences. (addresses Core component 4.B.1).

Further review of program outcomes occurs in the five-year Program Review self-study document submitted by the department. In the self-study that is submitted as part of the Program Review process, each program outcome is listed along with the courses in the curriculum that address that outcome. During the Program Review meeting there is an extensive discussion regarding whether the department’s programs are meeting the needs of diverse students, different employers, and relevant groups in the community, and there is an opportunity to review program outcomes to determine whether revisions are warranted (addresses Core component 3.B.4). A major part of the discussions in the Program Review meetings between the department and the review team center around whether programs are aligned with community and employer needs and whether any changes are appropriate. These discussions often influence or initiate program outcome revisions.

• Designing, aligning, and delivering co-curricular activities to support learning (Core component 3.E.1, 4.B.2)

Section 1P1 contained several examples of co-curricular activities that support learning. In addition to those activities that have already been mentioned, there are other activities that support student achievement of program outcomes. One common example is that many of our technical programs require internships that allow students real-world experience while mastering program outcomes. Many technical programs also feature a capstone course that allow for a final summative assessment regarding student achievement of program outcomes, often involving a project that simulates what students will encounter in the workplace. In many programs a practicum experience is required as part of the program curriculum. Examples include American Sign Language, Dental Hygiene, Nursing, Theatre Performance, and other programs where students will leave Sinclair and go directly into the workplace.

One of the best examples of a co-curricular activity that supports program outcomes is the Integrated Multi-disciplinary Capstone Project in our Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Division. This capstone brings students together on a design project from the following departments:

• Engineering Technology Design
• Architecture
• Civil Engineering
• Construction Management
• Energy Management
• Environmental Engineering
• Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning
• Mechanical Engineering
• Interior Design
• Culinary Arts

Students cross-collaborate on a single project each year. Sinclair has invested a considerable amount of time and effort to ensure best practices are incorporated into the interdisciplinary project. The first capstone six years ago was enhanced by a visiting scholar grant, and a nationally-renowned expert on integrated design was brought in to work with faculty developing the project in that first year. The next year a grant was secured to fund a trip to Lehigh University to study their interdisciplinary capstone. In 2014 a student team from Sinclair presented a poster session at the national Capstone Design Conference, and was the only student team from a community college. For the 2014-15 year, Sinclair will be working with the Civil Engineering Department at the University of Dayton on a joint interdisciplinary project for the capstone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting - ACC.S.AAS</th>
<th>To which course(s) is this program outcome related?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply mathematical skills to formulas and solve problems.</td>
<td>MAT 1460, MAT 1470, MAT 2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply the principles of financial, managerial, cost and tax accounting.</td>
<td>ACC 1210, ACC 1220, ACC 2101, ACC 2102, ACC 2211, ACC 2212, ACC 2321, ACC 2350, ACC 2322, ACC 2510, ACC 2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe and apply general business knowledge skills and computer skills.</td>
<td>LAW 1101, LAW 1102, MAN 1101, MRK 2101, ECO 2160, ECO 2180, ACC 1510, MAN 2101, MAN 1110, MAN 1106, MRK 2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use analytical problem-solving skills.</td>
<td>ACC 2102, ACC 2212, ACC 2321, Natural / Physical Science Elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects range from designing a new hypothetical Sinclair sports arena to working with outside clients to renovate existing buildings and design new buildings. The final night of the project is a dinner/tradeshow where students show case their work through electronic and tangible models, posters, and brief presentations. Advisory board members across several disciplines attend the tradeshow. Sinclair’s Culinary Arts students provide the meal for this event, and Interior Design students also collaborate on this cross-divisional event. Planning for this event begins nearly a year in advance. Students from various departments display their mastery of their specific program outcomes on a project that prepares them for the type of projects they will encounter where they must work with other departments on the job (addresses Core component 3.E.1). As a means of assessing learning outcomes for the project, advisory board attendees who attend the dinner/tradeshow use an online survey to rate the capstone teams against the specific program outcomes. Examples of the results from these ratings are provided in section 1R2 (addresses Core component 4.B.2).

- Selecting tools/methods/instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (Core component 4.B.2)
- Assessing program learning outcomes (Core component 4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

Each academic department is held accountable for assessing its program outcomes, and this accountability is reviewed annually through the Annual Update process and is examined in depth every five years through the Program Review Process. Figure 1.13 provides an example from the Accounting Department of how faculty in departments report their work for the past year on program outcome assessment in the Annual Update submission (which is identical to the way it is reported in the Program Review self-study).

### SECTION III: ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION & DEGREE PROGRAM OUTCOMES

The Program Outcomes for the degrees are listed below. All program outcomes must be assessed as least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED</th>
<th>YEAR ASSESSED OR TO BE ASSESSED</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHODS</th>
<th>WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply mathematical skills to formulas and solve problems</td>
<td>MAT 1460, MAT 1470, MAT 2170</td>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Eighty-five percent of the class successfully completed the sections of the lab that required formula formulation and correct calculation of pay and tax amounts. Although changes are constantly made to improve teaching strategies and learning outcomes, no changes are planned as a result of the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply the principles of financial, managerial, cost and tax accounting.</td>
<td>ACC 1210, ACC 1220, ACC 2011, ACC 2102, ACC 2211, ACC 2221, ACC 2350, ACC 2322, ACC 2510, ACC 2700</td>
<td>FY 11-12</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>The practice set, which is assigned to all intermediate Accounting students as a term project, was used to assess basic accounting skills of accounting majors enrolled in the first of three intermediate accounting courses. Students are required to analyze over 60 documents, journalize and post transactions, and then complete the end of year procedures for a small company, including the preparation of the financial statements. The transactions include bad debt write-offs and recoveries, basic payroll entries and dispositions of fixed assets. Based on the results below students exceeded in the 70% success indicating an understanding of financial accounting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While each academic department is required to report its assessment work with program outcomes on an annual basis, departments are not told how they must assess outcomes. Support is provided via the Divisional Assessment Coordinators with multiple training opportunities for assessment of program outcomes. Each department is allowed to use the approach that is best suited to its subject area. This flexibility allows departments to conduct program outcome assessment that makes sense in the discipline area (addresses Core components 4.B.1 and 4.B.2). Once all departments submit their Annual Updates, the Divisional Assessment Coordinators and the Assistant Provost for Accreditation and Assessment review submissions and provide feedback to departments regarding the adequacy and appropriateness of the assessment methods. While departments have latitude in their approach, they receive guidance and direction on strengths and opportunities (addresses Core component 4.B.4). The department’s work assessing each program outcome individually over the previous five years is reported in every Program Review self-study submission. Support for assessment of program outcomes is provided via workshops, Annual Update/Program Review feedback, and the availability of one-on-one help from Divisional Assessment Coordinators.

1R2 What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are expected in programs?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized

Each department is required to assess at least one of its program outcomes each year and must have assessed each program outcome at least once at a minimum in the five-year period between Program Reviews. If a department’s program assessment work is found to be inadequate during the Program Review every five years, a recommendation is made by the review team to improve program outcome assessment. Progress on that recommendation is tracked.
SECTION II: PROGRESS SINCE THE MOST RECENT REVIEW

Below are the Recommendations for Action made by the review team. Describe the progress or changes made toward meeting each recommendation over the last year.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Develop means to document direct measures of general education outcomes and program outcomes, and demonstrate how data are being used to improve learning outcomes.

STATUS
In Progress □
Completed □
No Longer Applicable □

PROGRESS OR RATIONALE FOR NO LONGER APPLICABLE
During the quarter to semester conversion, courses were developed with a variety of means to gather and assess general education outcomes. The data is assessed annually to determine if any changes need to be made to improve the acceptable level of student success.

Without exception, each academic department engages in General Education and program outcome assessment and reports its work through the Annual Update and Program Review processes. It is not an exaggeration to state that there is 100% deployment of assessment processes throughout Sinclair’s academic departments.

- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)

Each department is given the flexibility to assess their program outcomes in the way that is best suited for their particular area. Figure 1.15 provides an example of the Nursing Department’s assessment work on program outcomes from its Annual Update. Figure 1.16 provides a similar example from the English Department, and Figure 1.17 provides yet another example from the Sociology Department. Results like these from each academic department provide evidence that Sinclair is monitoring student achievement of the program outcomes.
### PROGRAM OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED</th>
<th>YEAR ASSESSED OR TO BE ASSESSED</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHODS USED</th>
<th>WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Demonstrate the ability to apply sociological perspective is defines as a) concern with the totality of social life, b) emphasis on the context (setting) in which behavior takes place, c) recognition that meaning is a social product, arbitrarily agreed upon d) focus on the group and social interaction.</td>
<td>General Sociology/Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Pre &amp; Post quantitative test and Pre &amp; Post writing assignment</td>
<td>Students in General Sociology/Introduction to Sociology gained in their understanding of the sociological perspective (appendix 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Understand scientific research methods used to study society. Interpret statistical tables, graphs, charts as they apply to an understanding of the human behavior and social life.</td>
<td>General Sociology/Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Pre &amp; Post quantitative test</td>
<td>Students’ gains were significant in the area of the sociological paradigms (theory). The lowest area of gain was in Integrating Data Analysis (IDA) or being able to read table charts and graphs and interpret the measures of central tendency. (Appendix 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Examine diversity in society and the impact of social stratification hierarchies (the inequalities) of gender, race/ethnicity, gender and age.</td>
<td>General Sociology/Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Pre &amp; Post quantitative test</td>
<td>In the area of stratification and social structure students had an 8% increase in fall 2012 and 6% increase in the spring from the pre to the post assessment tests (Appendix 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in the Annual Update template, after reporting data comparable to the previous examples, departments discuss whether they will be making any changes as a result of the assessment data, and if so how they will know whether those changes have had an impact. This guides the department to include continuous improvement as part of their program outcome assessment effort. The reported assessment work for all academic departments from Annual Updates and Program Review documents – as well as Program Review team recommendations - can be found on the Sinclair website at [www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/pdreview](http://www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/pdreview).

As discussed in 1P2, the Multi-disciplinary Capstone Project sought assessment from advisory board members via an online survey rating form. Student teams from the various departments received ratings on a nine point scale labeled from “poor” to “excellent.” Across all 47 program outcomes, 72.3% of the outcomes (34 of 47) had a weighted average of seven or above. Attendees were also asked to give an overall rating of the Capstone Event, and the overall mean rating across all attendees was 8.1 on a 9 point scale.

**Figure 1.18** provides examples of ratings provided by advisory board attendees of the student teams from three departments relative to student achievement of the program outcomes for their degree program as evidenced by their work on the Capstone Project. These ratings are used by the departments to document how well students are meeting program outcomes, and to identify areas where improvements need to be made in their academic preparation in the department.

### ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>TEAM 3</th>
<th>TEAM 5</th>
<th>TEAM 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and apply principles of system design, management and operation of water supply/treatment including skills and knowledge to sample and interpret contamination distribution in surface water and ground water.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and respect the ethical responsibility of public institutions and private organizations to society pertaining to environmental engineering technology.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand, follow and apply protocols for environmental site assessments. Detect the conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, petroleum, petroleum products and controlled substances by record or field sampling. Identify potential environmental liabilities associated with properties considered transfer.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge and skills to assess and initiate response to hazardous exposure minimizing their risk and the risk to surrounding population immediate property and the environment.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge of environmental laws to support compliance with the current and future, local, state, and federal requirements.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply basic science and fundamental engineering studies to identify, analyze and integrate solutions to emerging issues in environmental engineering technology including remediation and sustainability.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and apply principles of system design, management and operation of waste treatment and disposal including skills and knowledge to identify, analyze and process hazardous substances and wastes.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks**
- **Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained**

Sinclair has benefited tremendously from the long-standing policy of building General Education outcomes and program outcomes into the curriculum. Assessment processes could not have been developed without this structure in place, and Sinclair is well-positioned to engage in program outcome assessment as a result. The pioneering assessment work of the mid-1990s at the institution has resulted in a culture where having course and program outcomes is simply the accepted way that curriculum is built at Sinclair.
Academic Program Design focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders’ needs. Describe the processes for ensuring new and current programs meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

Sinclair closely tracks a number of different student groups. Figure 1.20 shows how the College identifies and addresses needs of potential students, current students, former students, and graduates.
The primary source of research on these student stakeholder groups is Sinclair's Department of Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR). RAR conducts surveys, designs educational research studies, and engages in survey, datamining, and modeling work to provide information regarding needs of these groups and how the institution can better meet them.

Sinclair closely tracks minority and low-income students. In Sinclair’s 2011 Systems Portfolio Appraisal, the reviewers noted that “Despite the importance of diversity and the increasing portion of Sinclair students who are younger students, results are not broken down by student subgroups.” RAR took this opportunity for improvement seriously, and immediately began including subgroup breakdowns for different ethnic groups and Pell grant recipients in its data reporting (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

Sinclair disseminates data across the campus through the RAR-maintained DAWN information portal. DAWN provides a large number of readily accessible reports on enrollment, completion, course success, retention, and other important measures. For most reports, subgroup data is available by race/ethnicity, sex, and Pell grant status. Figure 1.21 provides a DAWN report broken out by subgroups.

Sinclair uses this information to inform strategies to increase student success. For example, data indicated that one specific ethnic group tended to have lower rates of success and completion at Sinclair. In response, Sinclair developed the Light Touch program that assigns five new, first time in college students from the ethnic group with lower success to participating faculty and staff. With the goal of welcoming and supporting new students through a series of three calls just prior to and during the early weeks of classes, 107 employees contacted 500 students in Fall 2013 (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

Sinclair’s senior leadership identifies new stakeholder groups and determines their needs in the following ways:

The primary source of research on these student stakeholder groups is Sinclair's Department of Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR). RAR conducts surveys, designs educational research studies, and engages in survey, datamining, and modeling work to provide information regarding needs of these groups and how the institution can better meet them.

Sinclair closely tracks minority and low-income students. In Sinclair’s 2011 Systems Portfolio Appraisal, the reviewers noted that “Despite the importance of diversity and the increasing portion of Sinclair students who are younger students, results are not broken down by student subgroups.” RAR took this opportunity for improvement seriously, and immediately began including subgroup breakdowns for different ethnic groups and Pell grant recipients in its data reporting (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

Sinclair disseminates data across the campus through the RAR-maintained DAWN information portal. DAWN provides a large number of readily accessible reports on enrollment, completion, course success, retention, and other important measures. For most reports, subgroup data is available by race/ethnicity, sex, and Pell grant status. Figure 1.21 provides a DAWN report broken out by subgroups.

Sinclair uses this information to inform strategies to increase student success. For example, data indicated that one specific ethnic group tended to have lower rates of success and completion at Sinclair. In response, Sinclair developed the Light Touch program that assigns five new, first time in college students from the ethnic group with lower success to participating faculty and staff. With the goal of welcoming and supporting new students through a series of three calls just prior to and during the early weeks of classes, 107 employees contacted 500 students in Fall 2013 (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

Sinclair’s senior leadership identifies new stakeholder groups and determines their needs in the following ways:

The primary source of research on these student stakeholder groups is Sinclair's Department of Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR). RAR conducts surveys, designs educational research studies, and engages in survey, datamining, and modeling work to provide information regarding needs of these groups and how the institution can better meet them.

Sinclair closely tracks minority and low-income students. In Sinclair’s 2011 Systems Portfolio Appraisal, the reviewers noted that “Despite the importance of diversity and the increasing portion of Sinclair students who are younger students, results are not broken down by student subgroups.” RAR took this opportunity for improvement seriously, and immediately began including subgroup breakdowns for different ethnic groups and Pell grant recipients in its data reporting (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

Sinclair disseminates data across the campus through the RAR-maintained DAWN information portal. DAWN provides a large number of readily accessible reports on enrollment, completion, course success, retention, and other important measures. For most reports, subgroup data is available by race/ethnicity, sex, and Pell grant status. Figure 1.21 provides a DAWN report broken out by subgroups.

Sinclair uses this information to inform strategies to increase student success. For example, data indicated that one specific ethnic group tended to have lower rates of success and completion at Sinclair. In response, Sinclair developed the Light Touch program that assigns five new, first time in college students from the ethnic group with lower success to participating faculty and staff. With the goal of welcoming and supporting new students through a series of three calls just prior to and during the early weeks of classes, 107 employees contacted 500 students in Fall 2013 (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

Sinclair’s senior leadership identifies new stakeholder groups and determines their needs in the following ways:
One excellent example of this approach is the development of the Courseview Campus location. While monitoring population trends in the mid-2000s Sinclair became aware that there would be substantial growth in the 15-19 and 20-29 age groups in the county directly to the south, Warren County. This seemed to indicate that there would be an increase in demand for higher education given the dramatic increase in age groups that are traditionally associated with high rates of college participation. Moreover, that county was not designated as a service area for any existing state institution. Sinclair worked with state legislators to incorporate Warren County into its service area, and in Fall 2007 opened the Courseview Campus location to more adequately meet the educational needs of the changing demographic groups in the county. Within three years enrollment at this additional location had jumped from 316 in the first term to more than 1,000 two years later, and and since that time Sinclair has built a second building at the location and acquired several parcels of surrounding property in anticipation of future growth.

When new stakeholder groups are identified or new needs for existing stakeholder groups are identified, these findings are shared with the appropriate decision-making bodies on campus. These bodies then determine the impact and prioritization of the findings and if resources or actions should change, or changes in the strategic priorities or the operational approach are required.

In the example given above, the development of the Courseview Campus came after extensive review of the data and deliberation by President’s Cabinet regarding the best approach for meeting the burgeoning need for higher education in a neighboring county. As this location has increased in enrollment and educational offerings, a second building was added at the location to accommodate projected enrollment growth and the expansion of education offerings available. Additional information regarding the Courseview Campus can be found at www.sinclair.edu/courseview/

Within the past few years Sinclair has reaffirmed its commitment to meeting the needs of diverse stakeholder groups. Building on the Sinclair Diversity Strategic Plan, the College’s Center for Teaching Learning developed a Diversity and Inclusion continuing education program for faculty and staff. The Strategic Plan also initiated development of Sinclair’s Diversity website www.sinclair.edu/about/dinitiative. In addition Cultural Diversity Grants have been established to fund projects on a yearly basis that would support Sinclair’s mission to “celebrate diversity while promoting social responsibility, critical thinking, communication, and innovation,” with the primary goals of encouraging faculty to recognize and acknowledge our similarities, understand and respect our differences, and prepare students to live, learn, and work together in a global community. A variety of lectures, workshops, and special events have been funded over the years through these grants (addresses Core components 1.C.1, 1.C.2).

Another example of how Sinclair identifies the needs of different stakeholder groups, particularly with regard to multicultural groups, is the recent establishment of the Sinclair’s Department of International Education. Recognizing the growing importance of helping students understand and thrive in an increasingly globalized world, and in the interest of meeting the needs of an increasing number of students from other countries coming to the United States seeking higher education, the Department of International Education was established in January 2013 as part of a $2.4 million dollar International Education Strategic Plan (addresses Core components 1.C.1, 1.C.2). The International Education Strategic Plan specifies:

• Increased multiculturalism of the campuses
• Send more faculty, staff, and students abroad
• Deepened relationships with existing sister colleges
• Serve regional businesses and community-based organizations with global interests more effectively

Figure 1.22 displays the Globalizing Objectives and Results that the college seeks to achieve by 2017.

A more recent example of identifying and determining the needs of emerging stakeholder groups includes the development of the National Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) Training Center at Sinclair. UAS is a field experiencing a tremendous amount of growth, yet few established, formal educational programs exist in this occupational area. Since 2011, Sinclair has offered a UAS short-term technical certificate. Enrollment growth and student interest have triggered new educational offerings in this area. With strong regional growth potential for jobs, one recent study indicated that the UAS industry could potentially bring 2,700 jobs to Ohio by 2025. The Dayton Development Coalition is aggressively working to attract UAS development companies to the Dayton region, designating it as a “key industry” for the community. An educational infrastructure to attract UAS companies into the region will keep the emerging business and industries well supplied with skilled workers.

In recognition of the emergent UAS market opportunity, Sinclair sought and received $4 million in state funding to establish the National Unmanned Aerial Systems Training Center and immediately began work on a new UAS associate degree program. This illustrates Sinclair’s sensitivity and commitment to both the needs of the region and of its current – and potential – employers.

The development of the Courseview Campus, the development of the Diversity Strategic Plan, the implementation of the International Education Strategic Plan, and the founding of the National
### TABLE 1  GLOBALIZING OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Global Awareness and multiculturalism</th>
<th>ANNUAL OUTCOMES BY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign national students enrolled</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in study and service learning abroad</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff in professional development</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will serve in global internships</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Globalization of Programs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus global awareness events participants</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of global course offerings</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Regional Economic and Community Development through Global Engagement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from customized training services</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private contributions</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Global Partnerships</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deepened sister college relationships through established annual exchange programs</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Measuring Sinclair’s Globalization Success</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish and monitor measures of success</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UAS Training Center are four examples of ways that Sinclair has identified the needs of new stakeholders and developed a strategic approach to meeting their needs. These examples demonstrate the proactive steps that Sinclair takes identifying stakeholder groups and formulating strategies to accommodate them using existing, institutionalized processes. **Figure 1.23** displays some of the ways that Sinclair tracks needs of existing stakeholder groups and identifies emerging stakeholder groups (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2)

### STAKEHOLDER GROUPS, MEASURES, AND METHODOLOGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF MEASURE</th>
<th>PRIMARY METHODOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Community</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Surveys, Social Media, Advisory committee feedback, conversations with city/county leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislators, Accreditors, and Government Agencies</td>
<td>Identify areas of institutional strength and weakness</td>
<td>Ohio Board of Regents data and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Surveys, Social media, Meetings with community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Surveys, eAppraisal for staff, Faculty Performance Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders’ needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)

**Figures 1.20 and 1.23** display systematic approaches Sinclair uses to determine the needs of various stakeholder groups (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2). This feedback informs development and improvement of academic program offerings. This feedback can flow in top-down or bottom-up directions through Sinclair’s hierarchy. In both cases there are processes in place to ensure communication of emerging needs throughout the hierarchy. In addition, as department faculty and chairpersons propose new curriculum or revisions to existing curriculum, both the dean of the division and the Provost’s Council must approve all curriculum changes in the Curriculum Management Tool (CMT), and rationale for changes must be provided. This serves as another mechanism to facilitate knowledge of when new programming should be developed and when existing programming needs should be improved to meet stakeholder needs.

Departments also use input from advisory committees, articulating institutions, and accrediting organizations in determining when new curriculum is required or when existing curriculum needs to be revised. Leaders of all technical programs meet with business and industry advisory committees at least twice a year, which provides regular input from business and community leaders into program curricula. These advisory committees ensure that program outcomes and associated courses in professional/technical programs meet new and/or...
State requirements must be taken into consideration during development and revision of curriculum. The Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) publishes requirements for program approval at www.ohiohighered.org/academic-program-approval. The Ohio Board of Regents’ Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review details the process for submitting proposals for new associate degree programs and provides specifications for the curricula of academic programs. The OBOR sets specific curriculum requirements for different degree types. When designing new programs and courses, faculty members build upon the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) and Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGs). The OTM represents approximately one-half of an Associate of Arts (AA) or Associate of Sciences (AS) degree. Similarly, TAGs represent commonly accepted discipline-specific courses along the pathway to the Bachelor’s degree. Courses or course sequences identified as being a part of the TAG allow for guaranteed program-level transfer to and from any Ohio public institution. Like TAG courses, Ohio mandates that OTM courses universally transfer between public higher education institutions.

Sinclair’s efforts in developing and improving curriculum are made considerably more efficient by its use of the Curriculum Management Tool (CMT), an elegant and effective tool that Sinclair developed more than a decade ago to manage curriculum processes. CMT functions as both an approval process for curriculum changes and as a database through which to capture, retrieve, and display the approved current curriculum, including assessment outcomes.

When faculty members develop new courses and programs, they enter curriculum information (including outcomes and assessment methods) into CMT. Once all the requisite information has been entered, the department chairperson approves it in CMT. A workflow is then generated, and the division dean receives e-mail notification that new curriculum is awaiting his or her approval. The college-wide Curriculum Review Committee reviews the curriculum proposal online using CMT, offers comments, suggests revisions, and indicates votes of approval. Some requests require Budget Office analysis and input. RAR assigns CIP codes through CMT. Following the Provost’s Council approval of all new curriculum and program revisions, the most recent version of the curriculum is stored in CMT. CMT is considered the final arbiter of the curriculum – what is stored in the CMT repository is the “official” curriculum for the college. CMT provides a comprehensive approach to developing, improving, and reviewing programs as needs emerge.

From the inception, the College requires a solid rationale for all new program proposals. The purpose of the program, the rationale for creating it, the specific needs of stakeholders that will be met, and the role of consultants or an Advisory Committee in creating the program must all be provided in order for the new program proposal to be entered into CMT. Further review by the department chairperson, the dean, the Curriculum Review Committee, the Manager of Curriculum, Transfer, and Articulation, and finally Provost’s Council provide many opportunities to review whether the program is meeting the needs of different stakeholder groups (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

- Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs
- Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)

As described earlier in this category, Sinclair employs a Program Review and Annual Update process to assess academic programs. Currency and effectiveness of academic programs is a major component of the five-year Program Review, and is to some extent explored in the Annual Update process. Through the Program Review process established in 2004, each academic department undergoes an expansive review once every five years and completes Annual Updates in the intervening years. Figure 1.24 shows the time line of Program Review events for departments undergoing review during the 2014-15 year.

An integral part of the Program Review process is the submission of the self-study. The Self-Study, similar to an accreditation document, requires thoughtful analysis of the department/program faculty on all aspects of the program. Newly revised in Summer 2014, the current Program Review self-study template is broken into several sections:

- Course success and completion data.
  Departments are provided with degree and certificate completion and course success data, and asked to review these and any other data points that may be relevant to its operations. Departments are asked to provide interpretation and analysis of any trends that they discover.

- Progress since the most recent review.
  The department is asked to report on progress made on goals from the most recent Program Review self-study and progress on meeting Review Team recommendations from their Program Review five years previously. Each goal and recommendation is listed separately, and departments are required to report progress made on each of them (see Figure 1.25).
**FIGURE 1.25**
EXAMPLE OF ANNUAL UPDATE PROGRESS ON REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Below are the Recommendations for Action made by the review team. Describe the progress or changes made toward meeting each recommendation over the last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PROGRESS OR RATIONALE FOR NO LONGER APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate the need for developing a certificate program for those students who only want to enroll in particular course and not seeking a degree.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Some of the students taking accounting courses already have a bachelor/master degree and are coming to Sinclair Community College to get enough credit hours in accounting to be eligible to sit for the CPA exam. Therefore, completing an Accounting Associate degree is not their goal. Some students are taking only the tax courses to prepare them for the EA exam and to prepare federal income tax returns. ACC 1210 and 1220 are TAG courses and recognized by the state as completing Principles of Accounting. A student who is transferring to a four year institution will be completing the Business Administration transfer degree which includes the two TAG course above, thereby providing the student with two years of coursework accepted at the four year institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1.26**
EXAMPLE OF ANNUAL UPDATE PROGRESS ON OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

The Program Outcomes for the degrees listed below. All program outcomes must be assessed at least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Outcomes</th>
<th>To which degree(s) is this program outcome related?</th>
<th>Year assessed or to be assessed.</th>
<th>Assessment Methods Used</th>
<th>What are the assessment results? (please provide brief summary data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Exams, quizzes, papers and psychology simulations (1100, 1126, 2217, 2220, 2235, 2236)</td>
<td>PSY 1100 77% pass rate on this outcome PSY 1126 81% pass rate PSY 2217 83% pass rate PSY 2220 70% pass rate PSY 2235 81% pass rate PSY 2236 91% pass rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values/Citizenship/Community</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Literacy</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Outcomes</td>
<td>To which degree(s) is this program outcome related?</td>
<td>Year assessed or to be assessed.</td>
<td>Assessment Methods Used</td>
<td>What are the assessment results? (please provide brief summary data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to think logically and solve problems using analysis, synthesis and evaluator.</td>
<td>MAT 1250, 11310</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Exams, quizzes, papers and psychology simulations (1100, 1126, 2217, 2220, 2235, 2236)</td>
<td>PSY 1100 77% pass rate on this outcome PSY 1126 81% pass rate PSY 2217 83% pass rate PSY 2220 70% pass rate PSY 2235 81% pass rate PSY 2236 81% pass rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Assessment of general education and degree program outcomes. Each general education outcome and all of the outcomes from associate degrees that the department offers are listed, and departments are asked to report on assessment methods and summarize assessment results for each of these outcomes. Departments are also asked whether changes are planned as a result of the assessment analysis, and how they will determine whether those changes had an impact (see Figure 1.26).

**SECTION III: ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION & DEGREE PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

The Program Outcomes for the degrees listed below. All program outcomes must be assessed at least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year.
• Overview of the department, including mission of the department and its programs.
• Analysis of environmental factors and admission requirements
• Evidence of student demand, program quality, placement/transfer of graduates, and cost-effectiveness
• Strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats, noteworthy innovations from the past 5 years, goals for expanding and improving student learning, and resources and other assistance needed to accomplish the department’s goals.

In March and April, academic departments undergoing Program Review have a comprehensive meeting with their Review Team to explore issues raised in the self-study and to have an in-depth discussion regarding curricular offerings. Each Review Team is chaired by the Provost and consists of the following members:
• The Provost
• The Assistant Provost of Accreditation and Assessment
• Director of Research, Analytics and Reporting
• One academic dean (from outside the division)
• One chairperson (from outside the division)
• Three faculty members (from outside the division)
• One academic advisor
• The Division Assessment Coordinator
• Three other representatives (could include external advisory members)

Following the meeting with the department, the Review Team prepares a feedback report, including commendations and recommendations:
• Commendations – An extensive list of items that the department is doing well, strengths of the department, and activities that have improved student learning for which the department should receive recognition.
• Recommendations for Action – A list of areas where the department needs to make changes or improvements. Frequently these include mandates to improve assessment of general education or program outcomes, to explore improvement of existing offerings, to remove offerings from the curriculum that are no longer needed or appropriate, and to explore potential new offerings.
• Overall Assessment of Department’s Progress and Goals – A high-level overview of the current state of the department as determined the Review Team, and directions regarding next steps and future plans for the department.
• Institutional or Resource Barriers to the Department’s Ability to Accomplish its Goals - The purpose of this section two-fold. First, it provides feedback to the institution regarding what additional support is needed for the department to implement the recommendations provided by the review team. Second, it allows the institution to determine whether there are barriers that are systematic or institutional in nature because they emerge repeatedly from Program Reviews from various departments.

The Program Review findings highlight curricular changes that should be explored, particularly in regard to courses and programs that may no longer be needed or appropriate.

To track annual progress, departments submit an Annual Update report to the Provost Office. Figure 1.19 provided an illustration of the relationship between Program Reviews and Annual Updates. The Annual Update is compromised of the first three sections of the Program Review Self-Study Template as described previously.

After Annual Updates have been received, the Assistant Provost of Accreditation and Assessment and the Divisional Assessment Coordinators review and enter feedback into an online form. The Divisional Assessment Coordinators share that feedback with each of the departments in their division, providing an opportunity for continuous improvement in the quality of the Annual Updates as well as the overarching assessment program. (addresses Core component 4.A.1).

In addition to the Program Review and Annual Update processes, faculty members, department/program chairpersons and academic deans monitor the currency of academic programs and courses through weekly Leadership meetings.

What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution’s diverse stakeholders?

• Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
• Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
• Interpretation of results and insights gained

As previously described, the Program Review process provides a regular review of the currency and appropriateness of the curriculum while CMT supplies a solid, well-defined, well-maintained institutional process for establishing evaluation and implementing curricular changes. Figure 1.27 displays the number of recommendations from Review Teams during the Program Review process that involved the currency and appropriateness of program offerings during the past three years.

The Program Review process plays a key role in determining the need for curricular changes. One important part of this process is the creation of new courses to meet the changing community needs. Between August 2013 and August 2014, Sinclair approved 57 new courses via CMT. For each new course, a rationale established the need for the new course and its associated program.
During the same period, Sinclair added five associate degree programs, three one-year technical certificates, and ten short-term technical certificates to the existing inventory, as displayed in Figure 1.28.

**NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS**
- Aviation Powerplant Maintenance Technology - AVIAP.S.AAS
- Business Management/Digital Marketing - MRK.S.AAS
- Geography - GEO.S.AA
- Health Sciences - LHS.S.AAS
- Hospitality Management & Tourism/Bakery & Pastry Arts - BPAO.S.AAS

**NEW ONE-YEAR CERTIFICATES**
- Digital Marketing - MRK.S.CRT
- Digital Marketing Technologies - MRK.S.CRT
- Water Utility Technician - WUT.S.CRT

**NEW SHORT TERM CERTIFICATES**
- Arts Management - AM.S.STC
- Community and Urban Horticulture - CUH.S.STC (prison program)
- Computer Aided Manufacturing Basic Machining Skills - CAMBMS.S.STC
- Computer Aided Manufacturing Precision Machining - CAMPM.S.STC
- Greenhouse Management - GMC.S.STC (prison program)
- Industrial Robot Technician - IRT.S.STC
- IT Fundamentals - ITFN.S.STC
- Ohio Peace Officer Basic Training Academy - BAS.S.STC
- Professional Writing - PRW.S.STC
- UAS Precision Agriculture - UASAG.S.STC

---

Figure 1.29 displays the deactivated courses and the rationale for deactivation in Fall 2012.

**Figure 1.27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Number of Departments Undergoing Program Review</th>
<th>Recommendations to Revise Program Outcomes, Credit Hour Totals, or Other Curricular Aspects of Academic Programs</th>
<th>Recommendations to Explore New Courses or Programs</th>
<th>Recommendations to Study Viability of or to Discontinue Current Course Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 1.10 in section 1R1 displayed results from the employer survey, showing very positive results, indicating that employers agree Sinclair’s programs effectively prepare graduates for employment. Disaggregated results at the program level provide academic departments with employer feedback on graduate performance and adequacy of job preparation.

Further evidence that Sinclair meets the needs of its various stakeholders comes from the following sources:

- **College Accreditation:** Sinclair is fully accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. Programs of study are approved by the Ohio Board of Regents. Sinclair is authorized to grant associate degrees in arts, sciences, applied science, and individualized and technical study.

- **Program Accreditations:** A complete list of Sinclair’s accredited discipline-specific programs can be found at the following link: [www.sinclair.edu/about/information/accreditation/accrediting-agencies/](http://www.sinclair.edu/about/information/accreditation/accrediting-agencies/). The reaffirmations and/or approvals received from the external reviewers supply evidence that graduates have acquired the requisite knowledge and skills expected in the various disciplines.

- **Licensure/credentialing examination pass rates:** Health Sciences (HS) benchmarks pass rates against national data and set targets well above national averages. Pass rates in all programs are generally well above national rates every year (see Figure 1.30).

In summary, Sinclair has multiple checkpoints and processes in place to ensure a current, relevant, and responsive curriculum. In addition to career program Advisory Committee input, the Program Review and Annual Update processes provide regular, comprehensive opportunities to carefully review the appropriateness and adequacy of offerings. Additionally, graduate employer surveys and results from program accreditations/licensures ensure alignment of graduate skills with workforce needs.
Based on 1R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The College recently implemented a new template for the Program Review self-study to sharpen the focus on student and other stakeholder needs by requiring the departments/programs to

- Analyze and interpret completion and course success trends
- Report on progress on each goal from the previous Program Review individually
- Report on progress on each review team recommendation from the previous Program Review individually
- Report assessment work since the previous Program Review on each program outcome individually

By requiring departments to respond to each goal, recommendation, and program outcome separately, Sinclair has received more focused and actionable information during the reviews.

Two new AQIP Action Projects focus on how Sinclair meets students’ needs:

- Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion
- Building a Holistic Advising System

The “Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion” Action Project aims to enhance coordination and cohesion between various college systems to better facilitate student enrollment and completion by accomplishing the following:

- Coordinate and align our planning and scheduling of course and section offerings
- Enhance the monitoring and management of course section availability through the enrollment cycle

- Improve efficiency and lower the cost of our course offerings by increasing average class size
- Better ensure the availability of new offerings as course sections reach capacity
- Improve our ability to meet our students’ course scheduling needs
- Incorporate consideration of new state performance-based funding into our enrollment and scheduling/planning processes

Another AQIP Action Project, “Building a Holistic Advising System,” seeks to identify and implement a holistic advising system to address students’ academic, personal, career and financial needs. This project will involve a major redesign of our student support systems, where a holistic model will be implemented following a thorough investigation of alternative models. As part of this work, City Connects, an organization which has redesigned K-12 student support systems in the Boston, New York and Dayton schools, is being invited to help Sinclair develop and implement a college-level holistic advising system.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUALITY

1P4 Academic Program Quality focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities, and locations. Describe the processes for ensuring quality academic programming. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses, and learning they will pursue (Core Component 4.A.4)

Sinclair is an open enrollment college – there are no requirements students must meet to be
admitted. As a result, students vary greatly in their level of preparation for college-level work, and some mechanism must be in place to identify students who are not prepared for college-level work, and to refer them to the assistance that they need to get to that level. All new degree and certificate-seeking students, all transfer students who do not have transfer credits in English or math, students at other institutions wanting to enroll at Sinclair to take English or math, and any student who has not tested in the past two years must complete placement testing prior to enrolling in classes to assess writing, reading and mathematics skills. Sinclair uses Accuplacer software for all placement testing (including English as a Second Language testing) (see www.sinclair.edu/services/enroll/testing/ for additional information). Once the student has completed placement testing, the placement test results establish whether or not the student needs to complete remediation prior to enrolling in specific college-level courses. The College's registration system prevents students from enrolling in classes for which they do not have adequate prerequisite skills and/or the prerequisite course. A cross-divisional College advisory committee reviews Accuplacer results annually to determine appropriate levels, or cut scores, for developmental coursework. Many courses at the college require Developmental coursework to be completed as a pre-requisite prior to enrolling in the course. With input from institutional research, faculty set prerequisites for courses with changes approved by the College's curriculum review processes in CMT. Some programs have requirements that must be met prior to entry to the program, particularly in Health Sciences. Academic department faculty determine prerequisite knowledge and courses required for entry into programs (addresses Core component 4.A.4). Some departments use entrance examinations, GPA, and grades in selected prerequisite courses to determine program eligibility. Most departments in Health Sciences use the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) to determine academic preparedness (see www.sinclair.edu/academics/lhs/teas/index.cfm for additional information). Several Health Sciences programs are also involved in Accelerated Admission for Academic Achievement, where students who maintain a GPA of 3.0 or higher and receive an A or B in specified courses are moved into programs more quickly. Criteria that must be met prior to entry into Health Sciences programs can be found at www.sinclair.edu/academics/lhs/programapplicationpackets/index.cfm. Figure 1.31 provides an example of eligibility requirements for a Health Sciences program.

There are several avenues through which Sinclair consistently and systematically communicates the required student preparation and learning outcomes to both potential and current students. These include

- The College's website. The website is the primary access point for students and supplies information regarding preparation and learning outcomes. See www.sinclair.edu, particularly the “Academic Programs” link on the upper left.
- The Course Catalog outlines expectations for students in a number of ways. The Admissions section of the catalog describes overall College policies and procedures as well as those that are specific to new, returning, transfer, and international students. See catalog.sinclair.edu/.
- Each degree and certificate program offered by Sinclair provides information for program admission, if applicable, as well as graduation requirements. See catalog.sinclair.edu/#/programs.
- The curriculum information includes general course descriptions and detailed master syllabi so that students select courses that meet their educational goals. See catalog.sinclair.edu/#/courses for course descriptions and www.sinclair.edu/about/learning/assessment/assessccc/mastersyllabi/ for access to master syllabi for each course Sinclair offers.

Each Sinclair course has a master syllabus, developed by faculty, viewable online. Syllabi include the course description, credit hours, general education outcomes, program outcomes, learning objectives and a course outline. The Sinclair Faculty Handbook mandates that each course syllabus distributed to students must contain everything that is in the master syllabus; this is applicable to all sections of a course, including online, dual enrollment, and off-campus section delivery (addresses Core component 4.A.4). To help faculty meet this mandate, the College uses an eSyllabus tool to create a syllabus electronically by walking faculty through several
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steps and automatically pulling the master course syllabus and other course information into the syllabus. The contents of the master syllabus ensure uniform expectations of curricula across all sections of a course.

- **Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia, and when offering dual-credit programs (Core Components 3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)**

Faculty working collaboratively within a department set the standards that must be met in courses and programs at Sinclair. The Program Review and Annual Update processes, the career program advisory boards, and education partnerships help ensure that courses and programs remain current and relevant as occupational and community workforce needs change. Course outcomes, written by faculty experts in the discipline, specify levels of achievement that students must attain. Course outcomes must contain statements specifying expected level of attainment (e.g., “students must correctly answer 70% of exams questions related to the outcome”) in order to demonstrate achievement of the course outcomes (addresses Core component 3.A.1). Faculty incorporate these standards of attainment into the master course syllabus and, as such, all course sections abide by the same standard. As mentioned earlier, all Sinclair sections adhere to the master syllabus. Department chairpersons ensure that each course offered in their department covers the same course content and meets the same course outcomes. It is the expectation that regardless of whether students take a course online, in person, through a hybrid model, at the Dayton campus, at additional locations, or under any other circumstance, that the same content and course outcomes will be covered. This is also true for dual enrollment arrangements with local high schools (addresses Core components 3.A.3 and 4.A.4).

Sinclair has an office dedicated to fostering dual enrollment arrangements under the Vice President for School and Community Partnerships, and has recently expanded the number of dual enrollment arrangements with area high schools substantially. The Vice President works closely with Instruction to ensure teacher qualifications and standardized curriculum delivery. Department chairpersons assess the credentials of high school instructors who could potentially teach in dual enrollment arrangements, and oversee the presentation of the curriculum in the same way that they would with any other section Sinclair offers. The College holds these sections to the same standards as any other credit-bearing course (addresses Core component 4.A.4).

- **Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)**

Sinclair offers course credit for prior learning in two different ways: 1) Credit by showing proficiency through an exam or 2) credit for what students already know through alternate forms of assessment. Each of these approaches has several options available to students who seeking to get credit for prior learning experiences (addresses Core component 4.A.2).

(1) “Credit by Exam” Options

- **Advanced Placement Program** The College Board’s AP Program (apcentral.collegeboard.com) offers high school students the opportunity to earn college course credit by providing examinations in 34 introductory courses in 20 fields. Students must have their scores sent to Sinclair. Sinclair awards students with an AP exam score of 3 or above course credits for the AP exam(s) successfully completed. Additional information regarding Advanced Placement at Sinclair is available at www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/trs/advancedplacementprogramap.

- **College Level Examination Program (CLEP)** The College Board offers nationally standardized CLEP exams that may allow learners to earn college credit for knowledge acquired through on-the-job training, professional development and other activities. Students complete CLEP exams at test sites in Dayton, although not at Sinclair. To earn credit for a CLEP exam, students request that their CLEP scores be sent to Sinclair. Additional information regarding CLEP at Sinclair is available at www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/trs/collegelevelexaminationprogramclep.

- **DANTES Subject Specific Test (DSST)** DANTES Standardized Subject Tests (DSST) are nationally standardized exams that may be equivalent to certain Sinclair courses. DSST exams, offered at test sites in Dayton and across the nation, although not at Sinclair. Additional information regarding DANTES at Sinclair is available at www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/trs/defencactivityfornon-traditionalsupportdantes.

- **Sinclair Proficiency Tests** A learner who demonstrates knowledge and ability in a particular subject area may earn credit for specific Sinclair courses without enrolling in them. This is done by taking a proficiency test or by demonstrating a level of skill evaluated by the appropriate academic department. Testing fees range from $65 to $110 and above. A list of courses available for proficiency tests can be found at cmt.sinclair.edu/reports/proficiency/dsResults.cfm. The procedure that a student will use to take a proficiency test will depend on where they live in relation to Sinclair’s downtown Dayton campus. Additional information regarding proficiency tests at Sinclair is available at www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/trs/proficiencyexams/.

(2) “Credit for What You Know” Options

- **ACE (American Council on Education)** ACE provides access to transcripts for several of its programs through its National Guide resource (see www.acenet.edu). For students who
have received training through employers or a specialized training provider that has been evaluated by ACE, in many cases ACE has established credit recommendations that can help these students get their training translated into college credit. For ACE evaluations, ACE sends transcripts directly to the office of Registration and Student Records. Specific course equivalency is established by the department chairperson responsible for the subject area requested, and the course credit that is awarded is considered transfer credit.

- **Portfolio-based Assessment**: Many students bring a wealth of work-related learning and knowledge, outside expertise and life itself to Sinclair. A portfolio is a written description of a student’s individual learning experiences. To prepare a portfolio, a student must enroll in PRL 1100, Prior Learning Portfolio Development (2 credit hours). While in the course, students work with a faculty member to create individual portfolios.

- **Professional Certification, Licensure and Training Credit Equivalency**: Documentation of professional training, including copies of licenses, certifications or other credentials requiring passing an exam can be submitted for Prior Learning Assessment. The appropriate departmental chairperson determines on a case-by-case basis if any course credit can be awarded based on this documentation. If approved, this course credit is then added to the student’s official Sinclair record. While not always transferable to other colleges, these credits count toward fulfilling Sinclair graduation requirements.

More common than Prior Learning Assessment, many students transfer credits from other institutions to Sinclair. To receive transfer credit, students must contact previously attended college and universities and request that official transcripts be sent to Sinclair’s Office of Registration & Student Records. Upon receipt of a student’s transcript, the student is notified via U.S. mail, and then within 15 business days of receipt, Registration & Student Records equates any appropriate courses to Sinclair courses. Determination of equivalencies for course credit that a student is attempting to transfer into Sinclair is done collaboratively by Registration & Student Records and the appropriate department chairperson based on how well content in the transfer course aligns with content in the Sinclair course. Once the determination of equivalencies is complete, a full report of equivalencies is sent to the student via U.S. mail (addresses Core components 4.4.2, 4.4.3).

For many Ohio public institutions, transfer credit is accepted automatically in accordance with state law. This is the case for Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) courses and Transfer Assurance Guideline (TAG) courses.

- The Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) represents a transfer core of courses universally transferable to public community college and universities in the state of Ohio. Ohio’s Articulation and Transfer Policy states that “individual courses that are part of an approved Transfer Module are guaranteed to transfer among public institutions of higher education on a course-by-course basis. Students will receive credit for successfully completed courses from the Transfer Module without completing the entire module.” (see regents.ohio.gov/transfer/policy/transfer_policy_d2aa.php).

- **Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGs)** comprise Transfer Module courses and additional courses required for an academic major. A TAG is an advising tool to assist Ohio university and community and technical college students planning specific majors to make course selections that will ensure comparable, compatible, and equivalent learning experiences across the state’s higher education system. A number of area specific TAG pathways in the arts, humanities, business, communication, education, health, mathematics, science, engineering, engineering technologies, and the social sciences have been developed by faculty teams. A list of approved TAG courses can be viewed at www.sinclair.edu/transfer/tags/index.cfm?searchTerm=transferassurance#tags.

Potential transfer students may use Transferology to determine whether courses they have taken at other institutions have already been approved for transfer to Sinclair and application toward a degree. Additional details can be found at www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/vpi/transfermodule?searchTerm=transferology (addresses Core component 4.4.3).

- **Selecting, implementing, and maintaining specialized accreditation(s)** (4.4.5)

In consultation with the division dean and the Provost’s office, departments select specialized accreditations. Advisory groups and departments may recommend consideration of a specialized accreditations to make graduates of a program more competitive. Responsibility for implementing and maintaining these accreditations rests with the academic departments, working in tandem with the division dean.

When specialized accreditation reports need to be submitted, the department prepares the report; the division dean and Provost’s Office review the report before final submission to the external agency. The department schedules the visits associated with specialized accreditation under the direction of the dean, with active participation during the visit from the Provost’s Office. Sinclair currently maintains 43 specialized accreditations in its academic departments. A comprehensive list of these accreditations can be found at the following link: www.sinclair.edu/about/information/accreditation/accrediting-agencies/.

- **Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels** (3.4.2, 4.4.6)
As a two-year college, Sinclair offers a variety of short-term technical certificates, one-year technical certificates, and associate degrees. All programs at each of these credential levels have program outcomes specified by the department faculty, reviewed by the deans, the Curriculum Review Committee and Provost’s Office to ensure appropriateness to the program level, among other things (see section 1P2) (addresses Core components 3.A.2). Attainment of both general education and specific program outcomes is reported annually by departments via the Annual Update process and is reviewed in-depth during the five year Program Review. At the program level, outcome attainment is systematically and regularly reviewed and reported by departments to division deans and the Provost’s Office through the Program Review and Annual Update processes described in 1P3 (addresses Core component 4.A.6).

Assessment of students by academic programs is a valuable source of data regarding outcomes attainment, but it is not the only one. Additional work determining the level of outcomes attainment by graduates is done at the institution level via the surveys described below (addresses Core component 4.A.6).

- **Recent Graduate Survey.** This survey is administered to all Sinclair associate degree graduates between six months and a year after graduation. In addition to specific self-reporting on program outcomes achievement, students respond to questions about their technical knowledge, ability to function on a team, leadership abilities, self-confidence, self-reliance, logical problem-solving, communication skills, critical thinking skills, and several other workplace relevant outcomes.

- **Employer Survey.** Employers of recent graduates rate the skills and abilities of Sinclair graduates. Questions on the survey address general education and technical preparation.

- **Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities**

  Program outcomes are specified in the Curriculum Management Tool (CMT) by academic departments at the time a program is being developed, and these program outcomes must be met regardless of modality of the section being offered. For example, Sinclair currently offers the following completely online:

  - 9 associate degree programs
  - 2 one-year technical certificates
  - 6 short-term technical certificates

  The expectations for students who complete an online program is the same for those who complete programs through traditional course sections. Departments ensure the same level of achievement across all delivery modalities. Per Higher Learning Commission and Ohio Board of Regents mandates, program outcomes, required faculty credentials, and course content must remain consistent across all modalities in which the program is offered. Section 1P2 details assessment processes for program outcomes, and these hold true for all modalities. The expectation is that the tools/methods/instruments used to assess program outcomes will be static across different modalities, with the aim of maintaining a consistently high level of rigor across all variants of course and program offerings.

### 1R4 What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs?

- **Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized**

- **Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)**

- **Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks**

- **Interpretation of results and insights gained**

The results supporting academic program quality (see section 1R3) also provide evidence that Sinclair meets stakeholder needs. For many of Sinclair’s programs, credentialing examination comparisons supply an external quality indicator. Unlike internal assessment measurements, these external tests allow for quality benchmarking on a national level. Figure 1.30 in Section 1R3 provides the latest graduate performance on credentialing exam comparisons of Sinclair’s Health Sciences programs.

**Figure 1.32** provides Recent Graduate Survey trends across five years as an indication of program quality as expressed in graduates’ self-ratings. Recent graduates responded overwhelmingly in the affirmative, with between 85% and 90% of respondents expressing agreement across multiple years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>measure of</th>
<th>ratings on</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Quality of educational experience</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Additional study beyond the Associates degree</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Recent Graduate Survey. Scores of somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree are counted as ‘agreement.’

Results from the Current Student Survey provide further evidence of the quality of the academic programs at Sinclair. Figure 1.33 provides the percent of recent graduates expressing agreement that Sinclair provides a quality education, that faculty are knowledgeable, and that Sinclair faculty and staff are helpful. Level of agreement for these items ranged roughly from 89% to 97%.
Self-rating information about Sinclair graduate preparedness for the workforce is also supplemented by employer ratings regarding how well Sinclair graduates perform on the job from the Employer Survey. Figure 1.34 highlights the recent Employer Surveys showing an overall rating of 26 or higher on a scale with a maximum of 30.

Similarly, Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) (see http://www.ccse.org/) results provide student ratings of the quality of their educational experiences, as displayed in Figure 1.35. In the most recent year that Sinclair participated in CCSSE there were a total of 266 community colleges that participated, providing a rich source of external benchmarking.

Based on 1R4, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? The available data from current students, graduates, and employers of graduates reflect well on Sinclair in terms of quality of educational offerings and preparation for post-graduate experiences. Although the data from employers and students compares favorably inside and outside the College, Sinclair strives to improve and become a best practice institution.

Sinclair has systematic and robust mechanisms in place to monitor program quality, particularly through the Program Review and Annual Evaluation Process (ABLE).  

**PERCENTAGE IN AGREEMENT THAT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>measure of</th>
<th>ratings on</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Sinclair provides a quality educational experience</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Instructors at Sinclair are very knowledgeable</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Sinclair faculty and staff are helpful and available</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Current Student Survey. Scores of somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree are counted as ‘agreement.’ The survey questions that assess faculty were changed in 2012.
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CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS RELATED TO PROGRAM QUALITY

**FIGURE 1.34**

KEY EMPLOYER SURVEY RESULTS

**FIGURE 1.35**

CCSSE RATINGS OF EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

**ACADEMIC STUDENT SUPPORT**

1P5 Academic Student Support focuses on systems designed to help students be successful. Describe the processes for developing and delivering academic support to students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs (3.D.1)

As an open access institution, Sinclair embraces its responsibility to identify and support underprepared and at-risk students. The College focuses efforts on this population from admission through graduation. Several years ago Sinclair consolidated several student-facing service offices from various locations into the New Student Enrollment Center. This one-stop service provides comprehensive assistance with college application processes, new student intake, placement test preparation and placement testing, new student orientation, advising, referrals to specialized programs, web advisor, and registration for Sinclair and Adult Basic Literacy Education (ABLE).

Prior to registration, all first-time degree and certificate seeking students participate in required placement testing. Sinclair utilizes ACCUPLACER in its placement testing to determine whether students are adequately prepared for college level courses, or whether developmental coursework will be required. Recognizing the role that Sinclair can play in preparing high school students to take the Accuplacer tests, Sinclair established College and Career Resource Centers (CCRCs) in several local high schools to improve college readiness. These CCRCs provide self-paced, individualized computerized tutorials to help strengthen math,
English, and writing skills. The College administers pre-tests and post-tests to high school students to help ascertain preparedness for college level work. A primary goal is to offer prospective students an opportunity to improve their basic skills in math, reading and writing prior to college and thereby avoid placing into developmental coursework. For students who have graduated from high school, Sinclair offers a similar center on the Dayton Campus, the Academic Resource Center (ARC). At the ARC, students who have placed into developmental coursework have the opportunity to improve their math, reading, and writing skills utilizing the individualized tutorials. Once they have completed the curriculum on an individual basis, they may re-take the ACCUPLACER exam and potentially test out of Developmental courses. In addition, Sinclair uses the Early Alert system in all developmental courses, ENG 1101, and several math courses to identify students who are struggling. When faculty identify students in their classes who are not attending, have low scores, or are otherwise struggling academically, they notify the student’s advisor or counselor through the Student Success Plan (SSP) website. The advisor or counselor contacts the student and works alongside to address the issue, updating the faculty member on progress throughout the term (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

In recent years, Sinclair has participated in several major initiatives to increase the success of underprepared and at-risk students. One example is the Developmental Education Initiative (DEI), which unites 15 Achieving the Dream community colleges in an attempt to build on demonstrated results in developmental education innovations using grant money provided by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (addresses Core component 3.D.1). Innovative efforts at Sinclair that were part of the DEI initiative have included:

- **Math Modules.** Math modules, a flexible, self-paced lab approach to learning developmental mathematics, allows students to master the content at their own pace.
- **Boot Camps.** Boot Camps, an intensive review of developmental math content for students who test just below the next level of developmental mathematics.
- **Accelerated Developmental Courses.** These developmental courses allow students who tested just below the college level to take a tutorial-based developmental class as a corequisite to the college-level course.
- **Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)**

My Academic Plan (MAP), a program comprised of software tools and advising guidelines, helps students plan out their academic pathways to graduation. Students meet with Academic Advisors and create a MAP together as they plan out courses to reach their academic goals based on their level of academic preparation and the curriculum of their chosen program of study (addresses Core component 3.D.2).

The College provides incoming students with a checklist of enrollment steps, which directs them to meet with advisors to create MAPs. Faculty reinforce the development of initial MAPs and the revision of existing MAPs. Through the College’s Learning Management System, faculty can see which students have and have not developed MAPs with advisors, and whether students who have developed MAPs are “off-MAP,” meaning they have deviated from their planned course schedule. Faculty encourage students who don’t have MAPs to get them, and encourage students who are “off-MAP” to meet with an advisor for a MAP revision.

- **Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)**

Sinclair’s Faculty Handbook requires that all full-time faculty maintain formal, regular office hours (addresses Core component 3.C.5). The Faculty Handbook states that:

- Each faculty member will schedule office hours to be held at least five hours per week for student contact outside of class.
- Each faculty member will schedule office hours at least three days per week on campus
- Each faculty member has the option of scheduling two of the required five weekly hours in the form of non-traditional or virtual office hours, choosing from available technology.

The Faculty Handbook further states that for full-time faculty:

Formal office hours, with location, should be included on the course syllabus and posted on the faculty member’s office door. In addition to these formal hours, the College encourages faculty members to be available to students immediately before and after class and by appointment, as their schedules permit. Additional student contact time made available by appointment does not justify cancellation of any posted office hours.

While adjunct faculty at Sinclair do not have dedicated office space, the Adjunct Faculty Office includes a number of computer-equipped work spaces and a number of rooms for meeting with students. The Adjunct Faculty Handbook states that course expectations for adjuncts include that they “be available to students to answer questions and provide assistance relative to course work,” and furthermore states that they are required to “respond promptly to email from the chair, mentor and students” (addresses Core component 3.C.5).

- **Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1,3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)**

Sinclair support services include the following (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

- **Academic Advising Center.** Sinclair’s Academic Advising Center is designed to provide students with a collaborative partnership in helping students make good decisions about their education and career. At the Academic Advising Center, students meet one-on-one with advisors to develop their develop their
MAPs, laying out the courses that they will take in future terms. Academic advisors provide the following services to students (addresses Core components 3.D.2, 3.D.3):

- Evaluate placement results
- Explain degree and certificate programs and graduation requirements
- Int Explain academic probation
- Remind students about important deadlines for registration and degree completion

Sinclair is in the process of a major change in the way that Academic Advising is organized. A decade ago Academic Advisors were assigned to academic divisions, and housed in separate areas adjacent to their divisions. The disparate advising groups were consolidated into a single center a number of years ago, and all advisors became generalists, rather than focusing on a single division. However, in recent years there has been a recognition that having advisors focus on a smaller set of specific discipline areas may improve the guidance they are able to provide to students. The Connect 4 Completion (C4C) Program, funded by a grant from the Department of Education, will move Sinclair toward a holistic advising model. The C4C model is displayed in Figure 1.36.

As part of the holistic advising aspect of C4C, six “Career Communities” have been developed, which are groups of related subject areas that advisors would be assigned to, allowing them to focus their expertise in specific areas and thereby improve program specific information that is shared with students. The six “Career Communities” include

- Business Services
- Creative Studies
- Education, Liberal Arts & Social Sciences
- Health Sciences & Public Safety
- Information Technology
- Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM)

The College assigns students to an academic advisors in each of these Career Communities based on their program of study. C4C goals include: increase student completion by providing opportunities for students to connect with and solidify program and career goals, adopting a team approach for guiding students within each career community, providing students with efficient referral to resources, and engaging students with faculty members, employers and peers with similar interests. These efforts complement one of Sinclair’s current AQIP Action Projects, “Building a Holistic Advising System,” which seeks to identify and implement a holistic advising system to address students’ academic, personal, career, and financial needs. As stated in the Action Project Declaration, “As part of this work, we will invite City Connects, an organization which has redesigned K-12 student support systems in the Boston, New York and Dayton schools, to help us develop and implement a college-level holistic advising system at Sinclair.” The outcome of this four year Action Project will be a major redesign of our support systems at Sinclair that revolve around academic advising (addresses Core component 3.D.3).

- **Academic Resource Center.** The Academic Resource Center was established at Sinclair to provide a means for students who have tested into developmental coursework to improve their basic skills in math, reading, and writing, and then retake the placement test to see if they can test out of the developmental courses that they had previously tested into. After 10 hours of individualized, guided instruction in the relevant developmental area or upon demonstrating progress that would indicate a student would be able to test out of developmental coursework, the student is enabled to retake the placement test free of charge. Through this initiative, instruction is also provided to many area high schools to help prepare students before taking the placement test the first time (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

- **Center for Student Success (CSS).** The Center for Student Success provides degree or certificate seeking students who have low scores on Accuplacer placement tests the opportunity to work with an Academic Coach to create a Student Success Plan (SSP). Success Plans are specific to each individual student and address such issues as a plan to pay for college expenses, identifying resources/services to support success, reviewing strategies to improve study skills, assisting with selection of a college academic program and/or career goal and selecting and registering of courses. Student Success Plans also coordinates an early-alert system to help identify and respond to students in academic jeopardy. (addresses Core component 3.D.1)

- **Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL).** The mission of the CTL is to promote transformative teaching through collaboration and reflection to ensure Sinclair’s diverse students have varied opportunities for
developing their potential as members of the global community.” CTL work is guided by the following vision:

- **Classroom:** Encouraging innovation, classroom research, best practices, and discipline-specific and multi-disciplinary interaction.
- **Community:** Creating an opportunity for students, faculty, administration and the community to dialogue about teaching and learning.
- **Teaching assessment and peer review:** Teaching assessment and peer review to aid in the continuing development of faculty.
- **Mentoring:** Mentoring faculty to build learning communities and relationships between colleagues.
- **Resources:** Providing resources to support teaching and learning strategies.
- **Advocacy:** Promoting and advocating for teaching excellence.

Among the important activities that the CTL provides in support of its mission and goals are professional development workshops for faculty, the Adjunct Faculty Certification Course, the First Year Faculty Experience series of workshops for new faculty, Fall Faculty Professional Development Day, a variety of excellence awards for Faculty, and the Sinclair Teaching Excellence Academy. The CTL also oversees Service Learning at Sinclair. See ctl.sinclair.edu/

- **Counseling Services.** Counseling Services, staffed with licensed counselors, offers students free, confidential counseling to address and work on academic and personal concerns. (addresses Core component 3.D.1). Counseling Services also offers trainings and presentations on various topics for faculty, staff and students, including test anxiety, procrastination and study habits.

- **Developmental Tutoring and Learning Center (TLC).** The TLC offers students in Developmental reading, math, and English courses free, drop-in, professional tutoring. (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

- **Disability Services.** Disability Services provides assistance to all qualified students with disabilities, whether they are physical, psychiatric or educational. Disability Services seeks to encourage self-advocacy on the part of the student, and encourages students to independently access services. Additional information can be found at www.sinclair.edu/support/disability/ (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

- **Library.** Accessible online and in person, Sinclair’s Library services and support to students includes more than 150 databases, a collection of more than 100,000 printed volumes, 246 computers for public use, a Writing Center, and a lab designed for teamwork activities. Included in all new course requests, faculty members identify specific Library support needs through the Curriculum Review Committee process. Additional information can be found at www.sinclair.edu/facilities/library/index.cfm?searchTerm=lr (addresses Core components 3.D.4 and 3.D.5).

- **Student and Community Engagement/Student Judicial Affairs.** The Student and Community Engagement Office helps connect students to the more than 30 clubs and organizations active at Sinclair. The Office of Student Judicial Affairs provides leadership development and personal growth opportunities, while creating a culture of civility and shared community standards. This office also oversees the Students Judicial Affairs Code of Conduct Handbook, available at www.sinclair.edu/student/leader/pub/handbook/conduct.pdf, and handles violations of the Code of Conduct.

- **Student Support Services.** Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Student Support Services seeks to help students meet the challenges of college life, assisting them to stay in school and eventually graduate and/or transfer to a four-year college or university. Funding for the program is designed to support 150-200 students per year (addresses Core component 3.D.1). See www.sinclair.edu/support/ss/ for additional information.

- **Tutorial Services.** Tutorial Services provides free educational assistance to any Sinclair student who is enrolled in a class for academic credit, utilizing student tutors who are selected on the basis of academic background and interpersonal skills. Sessions are once or twice a week depending on the subject and availability of tutors. Walk-in tutoring is available in open labs and laboratories for Accounting, American Sign Language, Autocad, BIS, BIOSIS, Chemistry Resource Center, DEV, ESL, Physics Resource Lab and the Writing Center. In addition, online tutoring is available for math and English courses. To supplement the tutoring resources available to students, Sinclair has joined eTutoring.org, which provides free, professional online tutoring in writing, certain math subjects, accounting, biology, and chemistry. (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

- **Ensuring staff members who provide student academic support services are qualified, trained, and supported (3.C.6)**

Position descriptions for all administrative and staff positions specify qualifications for the role. Search committees and hiring managers/directors ensure that all staff hired into academic support service positions have qualifications and credentials appropriate to the position. Employees in student academic support areas benefit from several human resource processes at Sinclair that provide training and support. One of these is the eAppraisal process, Sinclair’s human resource management tool for employee evaluations. Through eAppraisal, employees and their first level supervisors engage in collaborative development of individual Continuous Improvement Targets (CITs) whereby employees and supervisors collaborate to determine appropriate continuous improvement and training targets.
aligned with departmental, divisional or institutional needs. Second level supervisors also review these CITs and the progress that has been made on them in the past year. In this way, employees in academic support services, as in all areas of Sinclair, experience a systematic and regular performance assessment founded upon focused improvement goals. (addresses Core component 3.C.6).

Another support for academic support services staff – and other college employees as well – is the Staff Development and Innovation Committee (SDIC), which composed of representatives from across the college and leads professional development planning for all staff. This group meets monthly to design, present, and oversee a variety of events and training sessions, along with providing funding for other activities such as conference support, fitness registrations, career seminars, and a variety of leadership development opportunities. The SDIC also encourages participation in cross functional teams for employees to get a broader view of the college’s operations and the skills required to support emerging challenges and opportunities (addresses Core component 3.C.6).

• Communicating the availability of academic support services (3.D.2).

A number of methods are used to ensure that Sinclair students are aware of available support services. The Sinclair Academic Catalog lists all student services and support, directing students to www.sinclair.edu/services for additional information. This online site makes students aware of available support services. The Faculty Handbook specifies that all syllabi used at Sinclair must contain information regarding learning resources including the following services, as applicable: Library, Writing Center, Tutoring and Learning Center, Tutorial Services, Academic Resources Center, and Disability Services. The eSyllabus tool automatically incorporates information on student support services into the class syllabi as illustrated in Figure 1.37.

Finally, academic advisors, academic coaches, faculty, and others who advise students serve as an excellent resource for informing students of available academic support services (addresses Core component 3.D.2).

• Determining goals for retention, persistence and program completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)

• Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of support services

In recent years goals for retention, persistence, and program completion have been heavily influenced by several initiatives funded by external partners. To facilitate coordination of these various initiatives, the College established a new position to oversee and consolidate these efforts, the Associate Provost for Student Completion. Reporting to the Provost, this individual coordinates major externally funded initiatives, ensuring integration and alignment of efforts. For many of these initiatives, faculty and staff participation in the implementation of strategies has been extensive. Completion by Design, in particular, showcases this. Many faculty received reassigned time to work on the various grant-affiliated teams. Sinclair collaborated with these partners in the formation of reasonable, attainable stretch goals, and RAR has guided associated student performance data to ensure that processes and methodologies support good practice. Best practice literature and widespread engagement undergirds the strategies and goals behind the Completion by Design initiative. Figure 1.38 summarizes these initiatives and their goals (addresses Core components 4.C.1 and 4.C.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Funding Begins</th>
<th>Funding Ends</th>
<th>Major Strategies</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate IT</td>
<td>$12 Million</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Fall 2015 with</td>
<td>• Competency-based education</td>
<td>TAA-eligible workers, veterans, unemployed</td>
<td>Increase completion rates in supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Dept. of Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td>potential for fourth year</td>
<td>• Self-paced; rolling starts</td>
<td>underemployed and incumbent workers seeking skill upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Connects</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>Current phase ends June 2015; potential for further support</td>
<td>• Connect students with college and community resources</td>
<td>Approximately 300 Dayton-Montgomery Scholarship winners in 2012, 2013, 2014</td>
<td>Increase degree and certificate completion rates from 30% for cohort ending in 2012 to 50% by 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion by Design</td>
<td>$4.8 million</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Current phase ends July 2014; eligible to apply for additional two years</td>
<td>• Clearly identify required classes</td>
<td>Approximately 5000 first time in college students each year with no prior college credits in high school</td>
<td>Using the 2005 cohort as a baseline, increase completion rates by 40% for the fall 2015 new student cohort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three of these initiatives are described in greater detail below.

**COMPLETION BY DESIGN**

Funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Completion by Design is an umbrella initiative to increase student completion through a structured pathway from entry to completion. Early successes have built on work already underway and include:

a. **Developmental Education Reform** - The following Developmental Education initiatives are designed to accelerate a student’s pathway to completion:

   - **Boot Camps** - Compressed developmental courses where content is condensed into one intensive week of study; offered between terms to allow students the opportunity to progress to their next course one academic term sooner. Since Summer 2010, 822 students have been served, with 82% of them eliminating one term of developmental education.

   - **Math Academy** - Self-paced Developmental Math courses using modularization to enable students to progress at their own pace with instructor and tutor support. 1085 students have been served at a 72% success rate, with 136 students completing multiple classes in one term.

   - **Accelerated English** - A Developmental English option that supports students with basic writing skills in conjunction with the college-level writing class allowing students the opportunity to begin college level English one term earlier. Students complete at comparable rates to those who test directly into college-level English.

b. **Program Pathways/Templates**

   - **Program Pathways** – While students often have many electives they may choose from to complete and academic program, having too many choices may be overwhelming. In collaboration with department chairpersons, faculty developed program pathways that not only provided recommended electives that students could take, but mapped out how the degree could be completed for a full-time student in two years by taking specific courses each term. Over 170 pathways have been created by chairpersons and faculty for degree and certificate programs at Sinclair.

   - **Templates** – Academic advisors use pathway templates to build individualized My Academic Plans (MAPs) for students. Over 37,000 individual MAPs have been created so far.

   - **Exploratory Pathways** - One-semester exploratory pathways have been developed for each career community, allowing students to focus on a broad area of study for one term while working with an advisor to sharpen their career focus.

   - **Institutional Policy Review**

   - **Policy Review Sessions** – In September 2013, Jobs for the Future (JFF) conducted a Student Success Policy Audit with a diverse group of internal and external Sinclair Community College stakeholders, from front-line staff to faculty, administrators, board members and K-12 and university partners. This audit focused the College priorities:

     - Immediate priorities
       - Create business practices that increase the impact of the course MAPs created by faculty and advisors
       - Create more structure for students through mandatory advising and orientation
       - Redesign the student success course
       - Develop an online orientation process

     - Medium to long-term considerations
       - Incorporate non-academic triggers into student course maps
       - Redesign academic intervention policies and practices to provide more support for students
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- Examine withdrawal policies to reduce the number of students who withdraw without first accessing resources to help them complete

CONNECT 4 COMPLETION (TITLE III PROGRAM)

Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, this program will increase credential completion by capitalizing on three inter-related components to create a comprehensive completion model:

a. Career Community System (as described earlier in this category)
b. Holistic Advising System
   - Provide holistic advising based on the City Connects model across four domains – academic, career, financial and personal
c. Information Technology System
   - Develop information system technology tools to support holistic advising

SINCLAIR CITY CONNECTS

Improving student achievement and completion is the goal of this Mathile Family Foundation-funded initiative. As part of this work, Sinclair invited City Connects, an organization which has redesigned K-12 student support systems in the Boston, New York and Dayton schools, to help develop and implement a college-level holistic advising system at Sinclair. By focusing on student needs in four dimensions – academic, career, financial, personal – and connecting students to services that meet their individual requirements, Sinclair seeks to give every student a better opportunity to succeed.

What are the results for determining the quality of academic support services?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible) (4.C.2, 4.C.4)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks (4.C.4)
- Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained (4.C.2)

Preliminary results from some of the student success initiatives discussed in the previous section can be found in Figures 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, and 6.9 in section 6R2.

Another indicator of the quality of the support services that Sinclair provides is student engagement scores. Since 2003, Sinclair has participated in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and uses information provided about effective educational practices to promote improvements in student learning and persistence. Figure 1.40 displays Sinclair benchmark scores on CCSSE for every year Sinclair has participated since 2003.

For a number of years Sinclair has monitored and addressed Active and Collaborative Learning scores based on CCSSE data. Efforts to improve active learning and introduce pedagogy leading to better student engagement have been a priority for the CTL efforts with faculty.

Figure 1.41 highlights the past three administrations of CCSSE (2010, 2011, 2012). Ratings have been remarkably consistent across time for the CCSSE benchmarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ALL SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
<th>ALL SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
<th>ALL SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
<th>ALL SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
<th>ALL SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
<th>ALL SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
<th>ALL SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Effort</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Learners</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1.40 SINCLAIR BENCHMARK SCORES ON CCSSE

FIGURE 1.41 SINCLAIR CCSSE BENCHMARK TRENDS
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Benchmark score comparisons with the overall CCSSE cohort and the top-performing colleges from the most recent year (those that scored in the top 10 percent of the cohort) are provided in Figure 1.42. As can be seen, Sinclair was slightly below the mean for the CCSSE cohort for Active and Collaborative Learning, Student Effort, and slightly above the rest of the cohort of Student-Faculty Interaction and Support for Learners. Sinclair’s scores were well below those of the top 10% of colleges in the cohort.

In addition to CCSSE, Sinclair also participates in the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE), which measures the engagement of first time in college students. Figure 1.43 displays results from the most recent administrations of SENSE. In each area, Sinclair outperformed other colleges who were participating in SENSE that year. However, relative to the highest performing institutions using SENSE that year (those that scored in the top 10 percent of the cohort), Sinclair’s results were substantially lower.

There are CCSSE items that specifically target the amount of support that students receive from faculty. As Figure 1.44 demonstrates, Sinclair’s scores on these items in the most recent administration of CCSSE exceed those of extra large colleges, which indicates that students at Sinclair feel they receive more support from faculty than their peers at similar colleges that participate in CCSSE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINCLAIR STUDENTS</th>
<th>EXTRA LARGE COLLEGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used email to communicate with an instructor</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Benchmark Summary Report - All Students (CCSSE) (page 14)
One key indicator of the success of student support is the nonsuccess rate, calculated at Sinclair as the percent of students receiving a D, F, or W across all sections offered at the college in a year. Figure 1.45 demonstrates that there has been little fluctuation in nonsuccess rates in the past several years. While increasing student success has always been a priority at Sinclair, addressing successful completion of courses has become particularly important now that 50% of state funding in the state of Ohio for higher education is tied to course success rates.

Based on 1R5, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.C.3).

Given the large number of completion initiatives underway at Sinclair, the next three years will be an especially intense time for addressing improvements in academic support for students. These improvements will include:

**Continuing work with Completion by Design.**

While much has been accomplished already by this initiative, there is also much to be done. Mandatory advising and orientation have been built into the checklist for new students, with 86% of new students following this directive. Efforts will continue to reach as many new and returning students as possible. The online orientation will be deployed to reach students in distance courses and those unable to make it to campus. A work team is developing a system to incorporate non-academic triggers into student course maps. An intense examination of withdrawal policies to determine whether the ease with which students can withdraw hampers student success is just now getting underway.
As intense as the work on Completion by Design has been thus far, and with as much as has been accomplished, there are still a number of priority activities that will take much of the next three years to accomplish.

**Further implementation of Connect 4 Completion initiatives.** Much progress has been made with the creation of Career Communities and the assignment of Academic Advisors to work in those communities, but these have only been the first steps. Approximately 2,500 students were engaged in career communities, during the launch of the initiative in Fall 2014, and adjustments may need to be made to our policies and processes once this initiative is in full swing. Work on information system technology tools to support the goals of this initiative is ongoing.

**Further work on the current AQIP Action Project, “Building a Holistic Advising System”**. The redesign of our student support systems is ongoing, and the holistic model is still being implemented following a thorough investigation of alternative models. Assessment of the impact of this effort will need to occur in future years.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Academic Integrity focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. Describe the processes for supporting ethical scholarly practices by students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- **Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)**

Section 8.2 of Sinclair’s Faculty Handbook describes the College’s policy regarding academic freedom (addresses Core component 2D):

8.2 Academic Freedom

The academic freedom of faculty to pursue without restraint the search for truth, and to freely express scholarly thought, is a core value of Sinclair Community College.

Sinclair values and supports the academic freedom of its faculty within the limits of prescribed course content and outcomes, and recognizes its importance in ensuring student exposure to the full range of viewpoints in the marketplace of ideas during their college education.

While research is not required of all faculty at Sinclair, per the Faculty Handbook “independent research” can be used to meet the “Scholarship and Professional Growth” Critical Performance Area in the Faculty Performance Review process (FPR). (addresses Core component 2.E.1). The Faculty Handbook also requires approval by Sinclair’s Institutional Review Board for “Faculty who wish to undertake research projects that involve human subjects…All proposed activities must be submitted for review and approval prior to the implementation of these activities” (addresses Core component 2.E.3).

**Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)**

Sinclair’s Student Code of Conduct (available online at [www.sinclair.edu/student/leader/pub/handbook/conduct.pdf](http://www.sinclair.edu/student/leader/pub/handbook/conduct.pdf)) specifies the expectations regarding ethical behavior on the part of students. Figure 1.48 in section 1P5 displays Sinclair’s Honor Code as contained in the Code of Conduct.

**FIGURE 1.48**

**SINCLAIR’S HONOR CODE**

“As a member of the Sinclair College community of students, faculty and staff, I will uphold the values of citizenship, social responsibility, and personal accountability. I will maintain the highest standards of professional and academic ethics. I will uphold my personal integrity, dignity, and self-respect by being fair and honest at all times and by treating all individuals with respect. By honoring these ideals, I will be building a better future for myself, my college, and my local, regional, and global communities.”

The Code of Conduct also lists 28 “Prohibited Behaviors.” Examples include:

- Disruption of, or interference with, any college activity, including teaching, administration, or other public service functions on or off campus, or other authorized non-college activities, when the act occurs on college premises
- Permitting another to use his or her college identification card, impersonating another, or misrepresenting authorization to act on behalf of another
- Acts of dishonesty.
- Hazing of any individual or organization as defined by the laws of the state of Ohio.
- Harassment.
- The denial of services or access to activities to an individual because of his or her race, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, or disability
- Physical abuse of any person
- Violation of a federal or state felony offense law
- Sexual misconduct of any person (See sexual misconduct policy under college policies)

The Code of Conduct lists potential sanctions for violation of prohibited behaviors, including educational sanctions, formal warning, conduct probation, facility suspension, loss of privileges, removal from class, revocation of admission, suspension, and dismissal. Procedures for hearings regarding a violation of the Code of Conduct are set forth on page 6 of the Code of Conduct (addresses Core components 2.E.3).

The Code of Conduct also provides guidance on the ethical use of information resources, spelling out specifically the behaviors that constitute cheating, dishonesty, and plagiarism.

Student ethical behavior with the use of information technology is also addressed. Among the prohibited behaviors are theft or abuse of
computer time, and unauthorized acquisition, use, or distribution of copyrighted works.

In addition, one of Sinclair’s General Education outcomes is Information Literacy, defined as “the ability to effectively locate, evaluate, and use information.” One of the subheading components of this General Education outcome specifies that at the completion of the associate degree at Sinclair the student should be able to “use information legally.” All Sinclair degree programs develop this skill at the mastery levels in students prior to graduation (addresses Core component 2.E.2).

- Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

Section 8.3 of the Sinclair Faculty Handbook states as follows (addresses Core components 2.E.2, 2.E.3):  

### 8.3 Academic Integrity

Sinclair faculty are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity in regard to all academic endeavors and professional involvements.

- A faculty member must verify that all materials presented or used in the execution of the faculty member’s professional responsibilities and activities comply with fair use standards and are free of copyright infringement.

- Faculty are expected to always provide appropriate attribution when using the work of others.

- Faculty will be fair and objective in evaluating students’ work.

- Faculty will not solicit nor accept anything of value that may constitute, or create an impression of improper influence in the exercise of the faculty member’s duties.

Several mechanisms exist for ensuring compliance with the standards of academic integrity enumerated in the Faculty Handbook. Through the Faculty Performance Review (FPR) process, faculty have an annual, individual, personal review of their performance with the department chairperson, which may surface any concerns regarding academic integrity and provides a mechanism for addressing those concerns. The college encourages students with concerns regarding faculty evaluation of their work or any other aspect of faculty performance or behavior to take their concerns to the faculty member, and if they are not resolved to department chairperson, and if they are still not resolved to the division dean, and finally if necessary to the Provost’s Office.

- Selecting the tools/methods/instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

Through collaborative development between administration and faculty, the College creates and revises its policies and procedures. Revisions to the sections in the Faculty Handbook regarding academic freedom and academic integrity require the approval of both parties. The Faculty Issues Team (FIT) designs the Faculty Performance Review process (subject to approval by the Provost). Both the expectations regarding academic freedom and integrity and the enforcement mechanisms stem from collaborations between faculty and administration.

### 1R6 What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity?

- Outcomes/Measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures where appropriate)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

One important result in determining the quality of academic integrity at Sinclair is that there have been no official complaints from faculty regarding Academic Freedom at Sinclair. Faculty Senate indicates there are no major concerns with the existing Academic Freedom policies implementation at Sinclair administration and Faculty Senate. On the whole, faculty seem comfortable that their freedom of expression in teaching their subject matter is adequately protected by the current Academic Freedom policies at Sinclair.

Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) comparisons document “the extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution” Compared to the PACE national benchmark, Sinclair employees have had statistically significant higher ratings for this item. Comparisons between the mean for Sinclair employees and the benchmark can be seen in Figure 1.49.

### Figure 1.49

PACE COMPARISONS ON ETHICAL COMMUNICATION WITH NORM BASE

Across these three administrations of PACE, ratings have increased for administrators, faculty, professional employees, and support employees, as can be seen in Figure 1.50. The most noteworthy increases across these years have been for faculty and support employees, who have experience a greater positive change in ratings than the two other groups.

Student Conduct records track academic integrity concerns. Figure 1.51 displays the number of student conduct incidents from the past several years recorded in the Maxient software that Sinclair uses to track incidents such as these. By far, the majority of the incident reports logged in Maxient come through the Ombudsman’s Office.
Figure 1.53 displays the information on charges and findings for AY 2013-14, the most recent year for which data is available. As can be seen, in the most recent academic year by far the most common charges were disruption and physical/verbal abuse.

**Figure 1.53** CHARGES AND FINDINGS FOR AY 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARGE</th>
<th>IN VIOLATION</th>
<th>NOT IN VIOLATION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical / Verbal Abuse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Comply</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattended Minors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Any College Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics and other controlled substances</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of dishonesty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted or actual Theft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted or actual Theft - Under $100.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft or abuse of computer time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Intoxication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALL CHARGES** 55 3 58

In the 2014 Course Catalog, 47 courses directly address ethics and ethical behavior. **Figure 1.54** lists these 47 courses, along with the number of students who have enrolled in these courses since the conversion to semesters in Fall 2012 (FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14). These courses educate a substantial number of Sinclair’s students on integrity and ethical behavior within their chosen area of study.
Based on 1R6, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Sinclair has well-established policies in place that set the parameters for both students and faculty in terms of ethical behavior and integrity. While individuals violate those parameters from time to time, issues associated with academic integrity at Sinclair, either on the part of students or faculty, appear to be neither widespread or systemic.

Education of faculty regarding the rights and responsibilities surrounding academic freedom is ongoing. Pre-test data from the CTL Curriculum and Assessment program indicate an ongoing opportunity to help faculty understand the parameters surrounding academic freedom. The Curriculum and Assessment track offered by the Divisional Assessment Coordinators through the Center for Teaching and Learning (see section 3P3) begins with an extensive discussion of academic freedom and what it means. From faculty comments at the outset of that discussion, it is apparent that more education is needed in this area. Many are unaware of the 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), despite its inclusion in the Faculty Handbook. Some faculty have been known to assert at the beginning of the discussion that academic freedom grants them the privilege of teaching anything they want, although this misunderstanding is always quickly dispelled by references to the AAUP Statement of Principles. Through the Curriculum and Assessment track, the CTL continues to educate faculty about the true nature of academic freedom, and in particular its relationship to course outcomes and the course outline.

As was noted in section 1R6, there have been some inconsistencies across the years in the way that student conduct reports have been recorded in the Maxient software tracking system as different directors have been responsible for logging these incidents. Going forward, there is clearly an opportunity to improve the incident tracking uniformity, consistency, and dissemination practices to allow for better trend analysis across years.
AQIP CATEGORY TWO: MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

CATEGORY INTRODUCTION
Sinclair is heavily invested in regularly collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data from select student stakeholder groups to meet student and other key stakeholder needs. Some of the most basic of these student stakeholder groups include potential students, current students, former student non-completers, and graduates/alumni. However, Sinclair also uses data to identify other student stakeholder groups of interest, such as specific ethnic groups that tend to have lower success rates, online learners who tend to perform less well academically than their in-class peers, and at-risk students (academically unprepared for college, low-income background, and/or first-generation college students). From time to time, new student stakeholder groups emerge through regional needs analyses, stakeholder outreach, and environmental scanning.

Through its institutional research organization, Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR), Sinclair faculty/staff have ample access to information crucial to meeting the needs of student and key stakeholder groups. These data, augmented by requirements of grant-funded initiatives, have increased substantially in recent years.

In addition to student needs, Sinclair continues to sharpen its focus on and response to the needs of key stakeholders, including employers, alumni, legislative/governmental agencies, and the service communities. Recently the College established a new division to focus solely on the school and community partnerships in response to changes in State legislation and demonstrated need in local high schools.

The College meets specific student needs through a variety of support services such as the Bursar and Counseling Services. Unique to Sinclair, however, the College has tailored services to meet student needs – examples include the Center for Student Success and the New Student Enrollment Center. In the various satisfaction surveys that Sinclair uses with students, for the most part students indicate satisfaction with these services, which in general serves as one indication that Sinclair is meeting these student needs.

Sinclair has responded rapidly to the changes arising from Ohio’s Performance Based Funding and several significant grant-funded completion initiatives. To improve responsiveness, the College created a Performance Based Funding dashboard to monitor progress to increase retention, persistence, and completion across departments, divisions and the College. The grant-funded resources, mentioned in Category 1, have resulted in a well-aligned, integrated series of common goals and strategies for increasing success, completion, and retention across the College.

In addition to students, Sinclair places a high value on feedback from other stakeholder groups. Sinclair benefits from strong, longstanding relationships with community organizations and local business, which provides valuable information on how well Sinclair is meeting the needs of these groups. To keep aware of and responsive to key stakeholder groups, Sinclair carefully monitors surveys, advisory committee feedback, labor market analyses, and other external data sources. Both formal and informal feedback from these stakeholder groups are generally very positive, and reflect well on Sinclair’s efforts to meet their needs.

Sinclair builds collaborations and partnerships on a large scale, from high visibility relationships with community, industry, and government officials to smaller scale relationships with employers, clinical supervisors, and internship providers, many of which serve on one of the 43 discipline-specific advisory boards. Transfer institutions, particularly area baccalaureate institution partners, provide collaborative relationships that have a direct impact on the success of our students. Similarly, high school partners supply integral connections to Sinclair.

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF PROCESSES FOR CATEGORY 2: INTEGRATED

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF RESULTS FOR CATEGORY 2: INTEGRATED

CATEGORY RESPONSES CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE NEED

Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Identifying key student groups
- Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services

Figure 1.20 in section 1P3 listed the following key student groups:

- Potential Students
- Current Students
- Former students, non-completers
- Graduates/Alumni

Data on the four groups listed above are critical to the functioning of any higher education institution, and Sinclair is no exception. Sinclair
closely monitors a number of specific student groups with distinct needs. As noted in Category 1, national and institutional success and completion data for certain ethnic groups led Sinclair to (1) closely monitor success/completion in these groups and (2) develop targeted initiatives to improve outcomes for these groups. Another example is online learners. With the rise of enrollment in online education in the past decade, Sinclair carefully tracks and communicates course completion rates in online sections relative to traditional sections. In general, the College documented lower success rates in online sections. Sinclair has put into place initiatives to improve online section course success. This shows another illustration of data leading to the identification of a unique student subgroup with needs that the institution needed to address.

As an open enrollment institution, Sinclair is keenly aware of the challenges of helping at-risk students succeed. Through study of the College's data, Sinclair identified the correlation between lower success/completion rates and factors such as academic preparation for college, poverty, and/or coming from a family that lacks a history of higher education participation. At-risk students represent a key group for whom Sinclair has invested a considerable amount of resources in an attempt to meet their needs, as evidenced by the initiatives listed in section 1P5. Again, this is another example of how national and institutional data led to the identification of a group with unique needs.

Identification of subgroups at times occurs in response to external requirements on the institution. For example, senior citizens at Sinclair represent a key subgroup – by state law, public institutions of higher education in Ohio have been required for many years to offer open seats in course sections to individuals over the age of 60 at no cost. Sinclair has embraced this mandate, and currently provides educational opportunities for between 2,000 and 3,000 unique senior citizens each year.

Previously, the college identified key student groups through its defined mission, an identified deficiency, or an external mandate. It is inevitable that, over time, new student subgroups of interest will emerge. The college has processes in place to ensure identification of these groups and their unique needs. Senior leadership determine new student groups through:

1) Regional needs analysis. In recent years, analysis of regional populations informed Sinclair of the greatest needs. In some cases, identification of underserved groups suggested development of new off-campus sites and offerings.

2) Stakeholder outreach. Senior leadership has frequent contact with external stakeholders, which often leads to the identification of opportunities or unmet needs.

3) Environmental scanning. Sinclair closely monitors changes in the local economy as well as changes in state or federal regulations or accreditation requirements. These sometimes lead to the identification of new student groups that Sinclair can serve.

4) Program review. Senior leaders receive recommendations from the Academic Program Review findings, annual Advisory Committee feedback from all discipline-specific advisory boards, and program-specific accreditation findings. These results surface common themes and needs for the institution. Specific student and key stakeholder groups have been identified through these processes.

**Meeting changing student needs**

**Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)**

RAR compiles and communicates data to allow for cross-campus monitoring of student success, retention, satisfaction, and other outcome measures. This allows for a continuous flow of information about student needs. Through student surveys and ongoing analysis of student record data, Sinclair staff and faculty routinely use information to recognize and address changing student needs. RAR’s work is key to the President’s yearly “State of the College” address (available at www.sinclair.edu/about/president/state/index.cfm), which provides an overview of the current direction of the college and emerging opportunities. The President and his senior leaders regularly present and discuss these opportunities in monthly Leadership Council meetings in which all directors, deans, and vice presidents participate. As specific needs emerge from these conversations, the appropriate division or department in the college is empowered to address the issue.

Sinclair’s efforts at meeting the needs of its students have increased substantially in recent years through the grant-funded initiatives discussed in Category 1. This work has involved gathering qualitative data from over 1,000 students and 1,300 faculty and staff. Meeting the needs of students to increase their success and completion is the goal of these efforts, and much of the work described in Category 1 involves targeting specific student groups and designing interventions aimed at meeting the unique needs. See section 1P5 for additional details on these efforts.

Supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs often involves dedicating resources through a designated office on campus. While not an exhaustive list, Figure 2.1 provides examples of several distinct student subgroups and the office on campus that has been designated to meet their needs (addresses Core component 3.D.1).
A number of academic support services were listed in section 1P5. Figure 2.2 displays some of the key non-academic student support services at Sinclair (addresses Core component 3.D.2).

### KEY NON-ACADEMIC STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES AT SINCLAIR

- **Bursar**
  
- **Campus Police**
  
- **Financial Aid and Scholarships**
  
- **Food Service (operated by a third party)**
  
- **Information Technology Services**
  
- **New Student Enrollment Center**
  
- **Parking (operated by a third party)**
  
- **Registration and Student Records**
  
- **Sinclair Bookstore**

### KEY STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

- **Veterans**
  - Veteran Services
  - www.sinclair.edu/services/veteran/

- **Senior Citizens**
  - College for Lifelong Learning
  - www.sinclair.edu/lifelong/

- **At-Risk Students**
  - Connect 4 Completion

- **Online Learners**
  - eLearning
  - www.sinclair.edu/online/

- **Students with Disabilities**
  - Disability Services
  - www.sinclair.edu/support/disability/

### FIGURE 2.1

**SINCLAIR DEPARTMENTS DEDICATED TO MEETING NEEDS OF SPECIFIC STUDENT SUBGROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT SUBGROUP</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT DEDICATED TO MEETING SUBGROUP’S NEEDS</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>Veteran Services</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/services/veteran/">www.sinclair.edu/services/veteran/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens</td>
<td>College for Lifelong Learning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/lifelong/">www.sinclair.edu/lifelong/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Learners</td>
<td>eLearning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/online/">www.sinclair.edu/online/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>Disability Services</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sinclair.edu/support/disability/">www.sinclair.edu/support/disability/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 2.2

**KEY NON-ACADEMIC STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES AT SINCLAIR**

- **Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)**

- **Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained, and supported (3.C.6)**

  For each position in the non-academic support services listed above, position descriptions specify qualifications for the position, and at the time that search committees review applicants for open positions they ensure that all staff hired into academic support service positions have qualifications and credentials appropriate to the position.

  Sinclair’s eAppraisal process is a valuable tool in ensuring that current staff remain qualified for their positions through annual review of employee performance in relation to the position description. Employees and supervisors collaborate to determine appropriate Continuous Improvement Targets (CITs) that are aligned with departmental, divisional or institutional needs and specific to the development of the individual employee. Second level supervisors also review these CITs and the progress that has been made on them in the past year, providing a systematic and regular performance assessment. Non-academic support staff also benefit from the Staff Development and Innovation Committee (SDIC) described in Category 1 (addresses Core component 3.C.6).

- **Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)**

  Sinclair communicates available support services through the Course Catalog website at www.sinclair.edu/services.

Per the Sinclair Faculty Handbook (www.sinclair.edu/about/pub/faculty_handbook.pdf), faculty include in their course syllabi “information regarding College and Department Learning Resources including the following services, as applicable: Library, Writing Center, Tutoring and Learning Center, Tutorial Services, Academic Resources Center, and Disability Services.” All syllabi at Sinclair comply with Faculty Handbook regulations, communicating the availability of non-academic support services to students (addresses Core component 3.D.2).

- **Selecting tools/methods/instruments to assess student needs**

- **Assessing the degree to which student needs are met**

  Figure 1.20 in section 1P3 displays some of the methods used to assess the needs of potential students, current students, former students, and graduates. These methods include:

  - Surveys
  - Social Media
  - Analysis of student records
  - Data mining
  - Market research
  - Tracking transfer students

  Tool selection occurs via a two-step process: (1) College decision makers identify the student need where more data are required, and then (2) the decision maker and RAR develop the best approach to data collection. RAR provides data from various sources that help identify changing needs of students, including survey research,

  ...
MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

What are the results for determining if current and prospective students’ needs are being met?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

The primary sources for whether Sinclair is meeting student needs include student and graduate survey results, employer surveys, accreditation results, program reviews (both academic and non-academic), credentialing exam pass rates, and advisory committees. One important source of information is the Current Student Survey, administered to a sample of Sinclair students every Fall term (and beginning recently, in Spring term). Figure 2.3 displays trend data on Current Student Survey results that provide student feedback on various ways that Sinclair attempts to meet students’ needs. As can be seen by these results, students generally express positive feelings regarding Sinclair efforts to meet their needs in terms of access, quality and providing a supportive environment, although course scheduling and availability appears to be an area where students indicate there is room for improvement. Due to changes in questions from year to year, trend data for some survey questions may be limited.
Sinclair’s Recent Graduate Survey also provides valuable feedback regarding Sinclair’s efforts to meet student needs. The Recent Graduate Survey is administered to Sinclair graduates 6 months to a year after graduation. Student responses regarding Sinclair contributions to job preparation and the overall educational experience at Sinclair are provided in Figure 2.4.

An additional source of overall feelings regarding educational experiences at Sinclair comes from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Figure 2.5 shows responses to the CCSSE survey item “How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this college?” Responses from Sinclair students are slightly more positive than those of other colleges in Sinclair’s enrollment range and all CCSSE colleges.

Yet another data point relevant to whether Sinclair is meeting students’ needs come from the Employer Survey. The College administers the Employer Survey to employers of Sinclair graduates six months to a year post graduation, and among other questions asks employers to rate the overall job preparation of Sinclair graduates. As can be seen in Figure 2.6, year after year employers rate their Sinclair graduate employees very positively.
On the whole, the feedback received from students, graduates, and employers of Sinclair graduates indicates that Sinclair is doing a good job of meeting their needs, although the data certainly identify some possible areas to focus improvement efforts, particularly involving availability of classes.

Based on 2R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Availability of classes has historically been an area where students rated Sinclair lower than other areas in the Current Student Survey. While it is not realistic to think that Sinclair could provide course offerings to match the preference of every student, steps have been taken to better align course offerings with student desires. As part of the “Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion” AQIP Action Project (see Category 1), Sinclair engaged an external consultant to create a rough model to predict course scheduling needs. RAR is currently working to refine the model to focus on specific aspects of scheduling (location and modality). In addition, RAR, working in conjunction with Instruction, has developed a Visual Analytics Course Planning tool that provides a variety of data points to academic department chairpersons when they begin building a schedule for the term. These data points include enrollment from the most recent term, number of sections added and cancelled in the most recent term, historical average class size data, average class size targets based on the budget, and the Two-Year Course Planning Guide. It is hoped that these innovations will allow Sinclair to better match availability of courses to student needs.

The Two-Year Course Planning Guide deserves special mention as an attempt to improve course availability information provided to students. Also part of the “Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion” AQIP Action Project, the Guide contains information for every course Sinclair offers regarding terms and locations in which the course will be scheduled. Updated each spring to add another year, the Guide maintains a two-year outlook. Advisors use the Guide in building MAPs for students, improving the likelihood that courses in the students’ MAPs will be offered when the students need them.

RETENTION, PERSISTENCE, AND COMPLETION

2P2 Retention, Persistence, and Completion focus on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence, and completion to stakeholders for decision-making. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Collecting student retention, persistence, and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)
- Determining targets for student retention, persistence, and completion
- Analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion
- Meeting targets for retention, persistence, and completion (4.C.1)
- Selecting tools/methods/instruments to assess retention, persistence, and completion (4.C.4)

Student retention, persistence, and completion have always been among the top priorities at Sinclair. However, the importance of these factors has been heightened to an even greater degree due to two developments at Sinclair in the past several years:

1) The advent of Performance Based Funding (PBF). As can be seen in Figure 2.7, in FY 2014 state funding accounted for 33% of Sinclair’s revenue.

This, however, was at the tail end of a decade-long decrease in state funding for Sinclair. Figure 2.8 displays trends in Sinclair’s three major revenue sources in the since FY 01.
During FY 2014-15, the state of Ohio transitioned to a 100% performance-based funding model for public institutions of higher education. All state funding to public community colleges is based on the performance measures displayed in Figure 2.9.

Since Sinclair’s state funding is now based on retention, persistence, and completion, the already heavy emphasis on these areas has increased. Performance based funding has created an added incentive for community colleges in Ohio to expend every effort to improve these outcomes for students.

2) The abundance of completion initiatives that the college has undertaken in the past few years. Completion by Design, Connect 4 Completion, and several other grant-funded initiatives (see Category 1) led to an increased dedication of time, resources, and funds at the college devoted to increasing student persistence and completion. Many of these initiatives have specific targets for improving success outcomes for students that have been developed by the college in concert with the specific funding partner (addresses Core component 4.C.1).

These factors triggered a renewed emphasis on student retention, persistence, and completion at Sinclair, and they have shaped the way that the College collects data, analyzes results, and determines achievement targets. To assist in the collection and analysis of data, RAR created a Visual Analytics tool called the Performance Based Funding Dashboard (described earlier in this category) which provides information on all of the data points included in the state funding model. At any time, all college decision makers have access to up to date data on the success and completion indicators that factor into the funding formula.

Through this report, derived from student records in the data warehouse, an analysis is presented in the Performance Based Funding Dashboard to inform Sinclair decision makers of trends and progress made in increasing student performance (addresses Core component 4.C.2).

Sinclair’s success initiative grant reporting requires a tremendous amount of data collection, analysis, and dissemination to the grant funders. Figure 1.38 in section 1P5 provided a comprehensive list of these initiatives, along with target goals and associated strategies. The goals of these initiatives are briefly summarized below (addresses Core component 4.C.1):

- **Accelerate IT**: Increase completion rates in supported programs by 20%; enroll 800 students during grant period
- **City Connects**: Increase degree and certificate completion rates from 30% for cohort ending in 2012 to 60% by 2018
- **Completion by Design**: Increase completion rates by 40% for the fall 2015 new student cohort
- **Connect 4 Completion**: Increase the percent of students completing a degree or certificate within five years from 15% in spring 2013 to 22% by spring of 2018
- **Developmental Education Initiative**: Reduce or eliminate the need for developmental education

Performance Based Funding and completion initiatives heavily influence the way Sinclair determines targets for - then collects and analyzes data for - student retention, persistence, and completion data. Although student persistence and completion have always been important to Sinclair, the College has reframed discussions and reformulated data into an aligned, integrated view, allowing the various departments to better study how their results help or hinder the College’s targets.

Meeting the targets is the common goal of the completion initiatives, described in detail in section 1P5. For each initiative, specific strategies have been developed to achieve the goals. Importantly, the College and grant funder set the completion strategies and goals collaboratively; they were not imposed by the external organizations funding these initiatives.

Sinclair has modified the tools, methods, and instruments used to measure student retention and completion in response to Performance Based Funding. In addition to continuing to closely track such variables as the number of graduates from year to year, IPEDS first-time full-time degree-seeking student graduation rates, and the percent of students retained from one term to another, the Performance Based Funding Dashboard displayed in Figure 2.10 is one of the key tools used in tracking degree and certificate completion, course completion, and success point data.

This tool and other similar tools utilizing information in student records have become key to managing efforts to improve student retention and completion at Sinclair. Information on the above data points is reviewed regularly by President’s Cabinet and the Chief Financial Officer. RAR has been heavily involved in developing these tools and gathering and analyzing data, helping to ensure that processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information in these areas reflect good practice (addresses Core component 4.C.4).
2R2

**What are the results for student retention, persistence, and completion?**

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Performance Based Funding has been a state subsidy game changer. Sinclair faces a challenge in that the community colleges that fare best under the new funding formula appear to have distinct demographic profiles. Figure 2.10 provides data that indicate community colleges with the highest Performance Based Funding indexes tend to be low enrollment compared to other institutions in the state, tend to be based in rural areas, tend to be somewhat distant from the nearest four-year institution, and tend to be located in counties with a low minority population.

Figure 2.10 provides a clear indication that Sinclair’s Performance Based Funding Index relative to other community colleges is not as high as we would like, although as demonstrated above there appear to be geographic and demographic considerations that work in favor of some institutions at the expense of other institutions. Further evidence of this is provided in Figure

Figure 2.11, which compares Ohio public community colleges in terms of course success. Sinclair has a long-standing commitment to student success and completion, and data such as this has led to a redoubling of the institution’s commitment to achieving significant improvements in these areas. As part of this heightened commitment to improving student outcomes, Sinclair is tracking new data points. The Performance Based Funding Dashboard discussed in 2P2 is relatively new at the college, but provides important data regarding managing student retention, persistence, and completion.

Figure 2.12 provides a basic introduction to the report, and also helps frame the data that will be shared from the Dashboard in the pages that follow.

Figure 2.13 provides data from the Dashboard regarding course completion, benchmarking against the statewide completion rate and completion rates for peer institutions similar to Sinclair. Through the Dashboard data are available at the department level, informing curricular decisions by allowing deans and chairpersons access to their completion rates. As can be seen, in each fiscal year Sinclair’s performance has been somewhat lower than the Statewide Completion Rate and the Ohio Peer Institution Completion Rate.

Figure 2.14 provides detailed data on course completion at Sinclair over the past three fiscal years from the Dashboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DRAFT FY15 PBF INDEX</th>
<th>2013 FALL ENROLLMENT (HEI)</th>
<th>DEGREE OF URBANIZATION</th>
<th>PERCENT OF HOME COUNTY POPULATION THAT IS MINORITY</th>
<th>DRIVING TIME (DISTANCE) FROM A UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS</th>
<th>MOST RECENT IPEDS GRAD RATE (2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College A</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>Rural: Fringe</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57 min (51 mi)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College B</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>Town: Distant</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>59 min (59 mi)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College C</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>Suburb: Small</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>43 min (40 mi)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College D</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>Rural: Distant</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43 min (38 mi)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College E</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>Town: Distant</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46 min (41 mi)</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College F</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>Rural: Fringe</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39 min (37 mi)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College G</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>Suburb: Small</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>59 min (59 mi)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College H</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>Rural: Fringe</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1 hr, 6 min (67 mi)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College I</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>Rural: Distant</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College J</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>Rural: Fringe</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1 hr, 46 min (97 mi)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College K</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>Town: Distant</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>53 min (42 mi)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College L</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>City: Small</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1 hr, 43 min (102 mi)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College M</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>11,942</td>
<td>City: Large</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4 min (2 mi)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College N</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>29,267</td>
<td>City: Large</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2 min (1 mi)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College O</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>12,276</td>
<td>City: Small</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28 min (26 mi)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College P</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>City: Small</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23 min (21 mi)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>22,853</td>
<td>City: Midsize</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14 min (7 mi)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Q</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4,409</td>
<td>Town: Distant</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17 min (14 mi)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College R</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>25,360</td>
<td>City: Large</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10 min (4 mi)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College S</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>8,964</td>
<td>Suburb: Large</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24 min (22 mi)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College T</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>14,963</td>
<td>Suburb: Large</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20 min (17 mi)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College U</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>15,213</td>
<td>Suburb: Large</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16 min (11 mi)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College V</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>Rural: Fringe</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32 min (27 mi)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introducing Performance Based Funding and the PBF Dashboard

Welcome to Sinclair’s Performance Based Funding Dashboard! As you are likely aware, Ohio has just shifted their subsidy funding model from one based almost exclusively on enrollment to one that bases subsidy allocations on the performance and success of the institution’s students. While conceptually this shift aligns well to support Sinclair’s intensive focus on student success, its potential impact on institutional funding is significant. It is thus critical that we understand each element of the State’s PBF metrics, provide college-wide visibility of Sinclair’s historical and current performance as it relates to them, and establish strategies to actively improve our institutional performance (and students’ success)!

This series of dashboard is specifically oriented around the PBF metrics. There will be a tab for each PBF metric. The population within the dashboards is limited to subsidy eligible students. Major components of the PBF allocations and their weightings are outlined below.

**Course Completion (50% of the FY 2015 allocation) - Successfully completed FTE**

**Completion Milestones (25% of the FY 2015 allocation)**
- Associates Degree Completion - Students who earn an associate degree from an institution in a given year
- Certificate Completion (CRTEs only at this point) - Students who earn a certificate from an institution in a given year
- Transfer to four-year institution with 12 credits - Number of students completing at least 12 semester credit hours of college level course work at that institution and subsequently enrolling for the first time at a four-year college or university

**Success Points (25% of the FY 2015 allocation)**
- Dev Ed Math Success - Number of students who successfully complete a developmental Math course in the prior year, who subsequently enroll in a college level Math course (at any Ohio public college or university) either in that year or in the current year
- Dev Ed English Success - Number of students who successfully complete a developmental English course in the prior year, who subsequently enroll in a college level English course (at any Ohio public college or university) either in that year or in the current year

*Access Categories*

In addition, three special populations or “access categories” have been identified to represent certain student populations that are under-served (traditionally-underrepresented and with low success rates) yet whose success is critical to the state meeting its postsecondary attainment needs. The categories support the access mission of community colleges for these students while still maintaining a focus on success. An added weight will be applied for students within these access categories who successfully achieve the course completion and completion milestone metrics. This weight is a way to recognize added assistance provided and support institutions that are successful in maintaining access and achieving success for these students. These access categories are defined as:
- Adult: Age 25 or older at time of enrollment
- Low-income: Pell eligible ever in college-career
- Minority: American Indian, Hispanic and African American
The Performance Based Funding Dashboard also provides data on course completion for the at-risk access categories, as demonstrated in Figure 2.15. Figure 2.16 provides information on degree and certificate completion by the access groups for Performance Based Funding from the past three fiscal years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>COMPLETED FTE</th>
<th>COMPLETION %</th>
<th>F GRADE FTE</th>
<th>W GRADE FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-2012</td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>14,831.6</td>
<td>10,947.5</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>1,545.3</td>
<td>1,879.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courseview</td>
<td>551.2</td>
<td>428.0</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton Campus</td>
<td>13,250.7</td>
<td>9,778.3</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>1,383.8</td>
<td>1,699.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>392.1</td>
<td>285.1</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huber Heights</td>
<td>489.1</td>
<td>358.5</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preble County</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-2013</td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>13,066.1</td>
<td>9,245.0</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>1,693.3</td>
<td>1,748.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courseview</td>
<td>463.7</td>
<td>366.9</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton Campus</td>
<td>11,782.0</td>
<td>8,307.1</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>1,534.2</td>
<td>1,606.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>330.6</td>
<td>234.9</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huber Heights</td>
<td>391.9</td>
<td>271.9</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preble County</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-2014</td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>13,568.1</td>
<td>9,803.9</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>1,785.3</td>
<td>1,672.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courseview</td>
<td>552.0</td>
<td>419.0</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton Campus</td>
<td>12,229.5</td>
<td>8,789.1</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>1,626.3</td>
<td>1,536.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>318.2</td>
<td>244.4</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huber Heights</td>
<td>391.5</td>
<td>285.4</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preble County</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the data provided in the Performance Based Funding Dashboard, Sinclair traditionally monitors student success and retention through other reports. For many years, Sinclair has monitored success rates (C or better) in its most heavily enrolled courses. One report, the Top 45, shows course success rates in the 45 courses with the highest enrollment. With the state-mandated change from quarters to semesters, the College no longer has historical trends prior to Fall 2012. Figure 2.17 provides the available success rate information in the Top 45 courses by fiscal year (FY).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>COURSE TITLE</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 SUCCESS RATE</th>
<th>FY 2013-14 SUCCESS RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG-1101</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY-1100</td>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS-1120</td>
<td>Computer Concepts &amp; Applications</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0022</td>
<td>Basic Mathematics Part II</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM-2206</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-1270</td>
<td>Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC-1101</td>
<td>Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0032</td>
<td>Foundations of Essay Writing</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG-1201</td>
<td>English Composition II</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0024</td>
<td>Introduction to Algebra Part I</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC-1101</td>
<td>First Year Experience</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALH-1101</td>
<td>Introduction to Healthcare Delivery</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0012</td>
<td>Academic Reading</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0026</td>
<td>Introduction to Algebra Part II</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-1370</td>
<td>Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIM-1101</td>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0020</td>
<td>Basic Mathematics Part I</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM-2211</td>
<td>Effective Public Speaking</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN-1107</td>
<td>Foundations of Business</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-1210</td>
<td>Introduction to Financial Accounting</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0030</td>
<td>Foundations of Paragraph Writing</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-1121</td>
<td>Human Anatomy &amp; Physiology I</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-1130</td>
<td>Allied Health Math</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN-2150</td>
<td>Management &amp; Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-1470</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS-1101</td>
<td>United States History I</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO-2160</td>
<td>Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-1141</td>
<td>Principles of Anatomy &amp; Physiology I</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW-1101</td>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG-1131</td>
<td>Business Communications</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM-1125</td>
<td>Introduction to the Humanities</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS-1111</td>
<td>Western Civilization I</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV-0010</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Reading</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY-2200</td>
<td>Lifespan Human Development</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC-1145</td>
<td>Introduction to Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE-1111</td>
<td>Introduction to Chemistry I</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO-2180</td>
<td>Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-1107</td>
<td>Human Biology</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-1111</td>
<td>General Biology I</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT-1120</td>
<td>Business Math</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART-1110</td>
<td>Art Appreciation - Introduction to Art &amp;</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT-2297</td>
<td>Special Topics</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS-1107</td>
<td>Introduction to Operating Systems</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALH-2202</td>
<td>General Pharmacology</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS-1100</td>
<td>Introduction to Computers &amp; Keyboarding</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sinclair recently received encouraging news from an analysis performed by RAR. In January of 2014 RAR completed an important longitudinal study regarding student persistence, retention, and completion. This analysis compared students in three cohort groups from the past:

- Students enrolled between 1998-2002
- Students enrolled between 2003-2007
- Students enrolled between 2008-2012

These cohort groups were compared in terms of degree and certificate completion, transfer to baccalaureate institutions, and students stopping out and dropping out from Sinclair. In each of these outcome areas, substantial improvements were seen with each cohort relative to the one that came before.

Figure 2.18 displays comparisons of these three cohort groups in terms of certificate completion. As can be seen, improvement in the percent of the cohort earning credit-bearing certificates improved both for the cohorts overall and for African American Students.

The data showed similar improvements with each succeeding cohort in terms of associate degree completion, as demonstrated in Figure 2.19.

Transfer and baccalaureate degree completion trends showed increased success as well. Figure 2.21 demonstrates that the number of students who transferred increased with each cohort, while Figure 2.22 indicates that the number of students completing a baccalaureate degree after transferring increased as well. Note that the improvements from cohort to cohort held true for African American students as well as the overall student population.

Related to Figure 2.19, Figure 2.20 provides an indication of what degree completion would have been like for the 2008 cohort had levels remained the same as the 1998 cohort. By this estimate, an additional 828 students in the 2008 cohort completed a degree than would have been the case if graduation rates for the cohort would have remained at 1998 cohort level.
Finally, this study indicated that the number of students stopping out/dropping out from Sinclair declined (or dipped) precipitously for later cohorts. Figure 2.23 displays the number of students in cohort who had stopped out or dropped out, with a decrease from 70% to 44% from the 1998 cohort to the 2008 cohort overall, and from 75% to 53% for African American students in these cohorts.

The grant-funded completion initiatives discussed previously have substantially focused and expanded upon the already robust work to improve completion; the data from this study provides encouraging evidence that Sinclair’s past efforts have had an impact on student success with additional anticipated positive effects in the future.

Based on 2R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.C.3)

As discussed in 2P2, the combination of Performance Based Funding and multiple grant-funded initiatives have significantly raised the priorities of student retention, persistence, and completion to new levels.

Continuing work with Completion by Design and Connect 4 Completion will form the bedrock for retention, persistence, and completion improvements over the next few years, with a focus on the following next steps:

- Continuing to increase participation rates with advising and orientation
- Rolling out the online orientation course
- Incorporation of non-academic triggers into student course MAPs
- Examination of withdrawal policies to determine whether it is too easy for students to withdraw
- Further engagement of students in Career Communities

In Fall 2014, Sinclair began a partnership with Civitas Learning to develop and implement data analytics as a means of encouraging student success. While this partnership is in its infancy, the College anticipates that this partnership will bring the following benefits:

- Provide faculty with better data regarding the performance of students in their classes, particularly in terms of identifying students who have hit triggers for nonsuccess in the course
- Arm Academic Advisors with additional program completion progress data on students assigned to their caseload, providing warnings when the student is in danger of going off track
- Enable students to take responsibility for their role in their education by providing up-to-the-minute data on course performance and program completion progress
- With a new taskforce just beginning to design processes and implement the Civitas Learning tools, the College anticipates substantial improvements as we deepen the institution’s knowledge of its students’ behaviors and broaden dissemination of this information.
- Implement holistic advising model that addresses personal, career, and financial barriers to completion.

KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

2P2 Key Stakeholder Needs focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups including alumni and community partners. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)
- Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership
- Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders
- Selecting tools/methods/instruments to assess key stakeholder needs
- Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

Some of the same processes described in 2P1 to determine key student stakeholder groups are also used to determine key non-student stakeholder groups, including regional need analysis, stakeholder outreach, and environmental scanning as described in that section. The College and the Dayton area share a rich history of working together; that history has led to strong relationships with community stakeholders.

In addition to the feedback mechanisms listed therein, the College also has a number of representatives serving on a multitude of state, regional and local boards, and community groups, which provide valuable information on the needs of these groups and helps Sinclair maintain strong connections to them. Reliance on local levy funding, as well as a long tradition of community involvement, requires the institution to play
a strong leadership role in working with local business and industry, state, regional and city government agencies, and the community at large. Sinclair continues an ongoing dialogue that builds its reputation for responsiveness to regional needs through newsletters, community leader briefings, advocacy with legislators, convening community representatives around key issues and interacting with citizens at a wide range of community events. Sinclair relies heavily on feedback from business and industry representatives on emerging needs, required curriculum adjustments, and new graduate competencies required for the contemporary workplace. There are many employees at the college in different areas that play specific roles in these connections. For example, faculty work closely with other colleges and universities to facilitate curriculum articulation agreements. The Vice President for Workforce Development has direct interaction with business and industry to better understand and meet their educational needs. The President, as well as many others at Sinclair, work closely with government agencies by serving on various committees in the community at large and by presenting issues to legislators and elected officials.

What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Feedback from graduate employers provides an important indicator that external stakeholders’ needs have been met. Via the Employer Survey, area employers are asked to rate the “overall job preparation” of graduates on a five-point scale where 1 is “Very Poor” and 5 is “Very Good.” Figure 2.24 displays results of these employer ratings between 2007 through 2014.

Another source of feedback regarding community satisfaction with Sinclair is trends in gift revenue. The amount of money donated to the Sinclair Foundation provides an indication of the value that the community places on Sinclair, although economics and other factors also influence charitable giving. Figure 2.25 displays the Sinclair Foundation dollar acquisition trends for the past several years.

Among Sinclair’s three revenue sources is a local Montgomery County real estate tax levy (some 24% of operating budget). The levy expires every ten years and to replace with another ten-year levy requires a public election. The general public is very aware of the levy and has high expectations for excellent service levels and low tuition rates in return for this extra source of funding (of 23 community colleges in Ohio, only six have this extra levy revenue). Sinclair College does not wait for ten years to be very attuned to community needs and alignment, it is a daily habit. Polling is done annually, as is other frequent market research. 81% of Montgomery County survey respondents agreed that their positive vote was worthwhile. Moreover, further attitudinal surveys conducted subsequent to the levy vote yielded the following results:

- 90% of Warren County respondents concurred that opening Courseview Campus Center was a good idea
- 93% of Montgomery County respondents had an overall favorable opinion of Sinclair
- 94% of Greene County respondents felt that Sinclair is important to the economic region
- 83% of Montgomery, Warren and Greene County respondents believed the quality of education at Sinclair is better or just as good as going to a four-year university

In addition to the foregoing data points, in January 2013 Sinclair performed the Community Leader Survey, which queried local community leaders on Sinclair’s effectiveness in a variety of areas. Figure 2.26 displays the results of the survey, which indicate that Sinclair is seen as effective by local leaders.

---

**FIGURE 2.24** OVERALL JOB PREPARATION RATING OF GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Year</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Employer Survey

**FIGURE 2.25** SINCLAIR FOUNDATION DOLLAR ACQUISITION BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FOUNDATION DOLLAR ACQUISITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$1,299,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$1,314,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1,718,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$1,229,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,428,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,570,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1,986,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,988,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2.26** COMMUNITY LEADER SURVEY

Sinclair’s Quality and Alignment

Community Leader Survey (January 2013)
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Similarly, a 2013 Triad Research Group telephone survey of 600 active voters from the communities surrounding Sinclair revealed that:

- 90% of respondents believed that the community is better with Sinclair than without it
- 88% believed that Sinclair offers a high quality education at an affordable price
- 76% rate Sinclair’s overall quality of education as good or excellent

While Sinclair gathers a tremendous amount of data from partner stakeholders, it is often difficult to find comparative benchmark data in this area. However, benchmarks are available for a limited amount of comparative data related to successfully meeting stakeholder needs, examples of which are provided in Figure 2.27.

Figure 2.27 indicates that Sinclair has the lowest in-county tuition in the state of Ohio, but in addition tuition has risen at Sinclair at a rate far below the mean for other Ohio universities and community colleges (see Figure 5.11 in section 5R2 for data showing a lower tuition rate increase at Sinclair). Figure 2.28 shows tuition rates based on data from the Ohio Board of Regents for FY 2013-14. Providing the lowest cost higher education opportunity in the state of Ohio to the citizens of Montgomery County meets a strong need for affordable post-secondary education in a community that has experienced severe economic setbacks.

### TABLE 2.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE COMPARISONS</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSSE</td>
<td>Although Sinclair falls slightly below the 2012 CCSSE cohort in three areas; Sinclair provides higher levels of Student-Faculty Interaction and Support for Learners compared to the 2012 CCSSE cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSE</td>
<td>Sinclair exceeds the 2012 SENSE cohort in 4 out of 6 benchmarks. In fact, Sinclair far exceeds the 2012 cohort in the areas of Early Connections, Effective Track to College Readiness, and Clear Academic Plan and Pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Sinclair exceeds PACE norms in all areas: Supervisory Relationships, Institutional Structure, Teamwork, Student Focus and Overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Ohio</td>
<td>Sinclair holds the lowest in-county tuition in the State of Ohio. In addition, Sinclair’s Fiscal Stability (Senate Bill 6) remains strong with a 2013 composite score of 4.2 out of 5.0. Of the 23 Ohio Community Colleges, only 3 Colleges received a higher score than Sinclair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 2.28

**OHIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ANNUALIZED TUITION RATES FOR FY 2013-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OHIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE</th>
<th>ANNUALIZED TUITION RATES FOR FY 2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHODES STATE</td>
<td>$4,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINCINNATI STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARK STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANE STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CENTRAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRA STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL OHIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOCKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWENS STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH AVG</td>
<td>$4,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO GRANDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBUS STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN GATEWAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKELAND</td>
<td>$2,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUYAHOGA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINCLAIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2I3** Based on 2R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

As can be seen from section 2R3, Sinclair’s ongoing collection of data regarding the needs of key stakeholders provides a wealth of feedback regarding how well those needs are being met. Without question, the College consistently looks for improvement opportunities; many of those improvements currently center on the grant-funded completion initiatives described in IP5. The City Connects grant is particularly important in this regard, as the major goals of the initiative include connecting students with community resources. Sinclair will continue to monitor information provided by the data sources discussed in this section so as to be aware of changes in stakeholder needs that warrant action on the part of the institution. Meeting stakeholders’ needs is a priority at Sinclair, and review of data points such as those discussed in this section is an ongoing process that receives attention from the highest levels of the college.

**2P4** Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key (non-employee) stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Collecting complaint information from students
- Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders
- Learning from complaint information and determining actions
- Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders
- Selecting tools/methods/instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

Students submit complaints in a variety of ways, depending on the type of complaint and the related area of the College. For example, in some situations students complete customer comment cards at multiple service points for departmental analysis and action. In other cases, formal steps should be followed; those steps differ depending on whether the student has an academic or non-academic complaint.

Per Sinclair’s Student Code of Conduct Handbook, the following are the procedures for student academic grievances:

- If a student encounters a problem in a class and wishes to file a grievance, they should follow these guidelines:
  1. Talk with the instructor and try to resolve the issue. If that does not work,
  2. The next step is to contact the department chairperson;
  3. Following this step the student may take the problem to the dean of the division. If the problem has not been resolved;
1. BIT reviews cases (situations or incidents) of student behavior concerns that may pose a threat to the student, others, the college community, or college operations.

2. BIT members assess the situation and gather more information as appropriate.

3. BIT members consult with any number of resources such as the student in question, other students, staff, faculty, Attorney General’s office, and/or other community resources as necessary to respond appropriately.

4. BIT members develop and coordinate a response that is consistent with the college’s mission, strategic priorities, associated policies and procedures as well as local, state, and federal laws.

Faculty and staff also have formal grievance procedures as noted in appropriate handbooks. The Faculty Handbook contains an extensive section regarding the faculty grievance procedure that can be summarized in the following steps:

**Primary Level:**

- **Step I:** Request for a meeting with the department chair to discuss a grievance.
- **Step II:** Request for a meeting with the division dean to discuss a grievance.
- **Step III:** The grievant may make an appeal of the determination in Step II to the Provost after conducting a personal conference between the grievant and the appropriate academic division dean.

**Secondary Level:**

- **Step I:** If a grievant wants to continue the grievance process after the Primary Level, the grievant must file a written statement with the Provost and the Faculty Grievance Committee of the Faculty Assembly.
- **Step II:** The Faculty Grievance Committee, upon receipt of the written grievance, shall meet within five working days to determine if the primary steps have been completed.
- **Step III:** The Provost shall review the determination of the Faculty Grievance Committee.
- **Step IV:** The grievant may appeal the determination of the Provost to the President of the college, but only as to any procedural irregularities alleged in the handling of the grievance. Upon the determination of the President, the grievance procedure is completed.

For non-faculty employees, per the Full-time Employee Handbook the following principles are adhered to at all levels and through all steps of the grievance procedure:

1. The right of all parties to:
   - a. fairness, equity, confidentiality, and non-prejudicial use of records;
   - b. the expeditious resolution of grievances at the lowest level possible;
   - c. appeal to the next step in the process; and
   - d. no retaliation or adverse action being taken against an employee who files a grievance, regardless of the outcome of the grievance.

2. The grievant has the right to be accompanied by someone of his or her choice to advise them at any level of the process.

3. If the employee does not receive a written reply to his or her written grievance within the time limits set forth in the grievance procedure, the grievance may be appealed to the next step within three days after the date the reply should have been received.
4. Any extensions to the given timeframe must be by written mutual consent of the parties involved.

For external stakeholders, generally the opportunity to share complaints occurs either through informal contact with college representatives in community groups and initiatives, or through participation on the many Advisory Committees that Sinclair maintains. On occasion, individuals submit complaints directly to the President’s or the Provost’s Office; the senior leader routinely refers those complaints to the appropriate office to move towards resolution.

Figure 2.29 in section 1P3 displayed some of the feedback mechanisms whereby information is collected from stakeholders. Complaints may surface through these feedback mechanisms. Sinclair takes complaints very seriously and invests time and resources in determining the legitimacy of the complaints and how to best address them. Sinclair sets a high priority on maintaining the confidence of the community, and consequently responds quickly to external complaints.

What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints? This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of the following:

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

As described, the College does not limit the points at which it accepts complaints. However, the College does abide by its published handbook policies in the way it receives and addresses concerns. This supplies avenues to receive student and key stakeholder complaints while providing flexibility in responding to these complaints as they arise. For example, student complaints could be initiated with one of hundreds of instructors through one of dozens of chairpersons through one of four academic division deans, and may be resolved at any of these levels without reaching the next level. There is no single College-wide database housing all complaints, although the most serious concerns and/or those with repeated patterns would be catalogued and tracked. There are, however, various data points that provide some information on outcomes in responding to stakeholder complaints.

Figure 2.29 provides data on academic petitions submitted during the past year requesting that “F” grades be changed to “W” due to extenuating circumstances, along with the number and percent of petitions approved by the Academic Petitions Committee. Most often a petition is denied because the committee has determined that the student had ample opportunity to withdraw from the course prior to the deadline.
Building Collaborations and Partnerships focuses on aligning, building, and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)
- Building and maintaining relationships with partners
- Selecting tools/methods/instruments to assess partnership effectiveness
- Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

Collaborations and partnerships at Sinclair occur at many levels, varying in scope and breadth. On a smaller scale, in addition to working with community and industry representatives and government officials, Sinclair has a longstanding prioritization of maintaining close, collaborative relationships with employers, clinical supervisors, and internship co-op providers, many of which are represented on the college’s discipline-specific advisory boards. Sinclair actively collaborates with transfer institutions such as Wright State University, the University of Dayton, and Ohio University to develop articulation agreements that facilitate the smooth transfer of students and graduates. In the case of articulations, faculty, department chairs and deans actively confer with counterparts at transfer institutions to develop articulation agreements, and then the Provost approves the formal articulation agreement or memorandum of understanding once it is developed. Organizations where students complete internship, co-op, clinical or capstone experiences all sign agreements with Sinclair to ensure a level of standardization and protection for both entities.

The necessity of passing the levy every few years requires community engagement and support, and as a result every effort is made to maintain on-going communication with the voters about the College’s operations. Surveys and focus groups routinely inform the College of the perceptions of the community and identify unmet needs and opportunities.

Much of Sinclair’s work in developing the large number of partnerships and collaborations the institution enjoys is motivated by David Sinclair’s credo “Find the need and endeavor to meet it.” Examples of these partnerships and collaborations are listed in Figure 2.32.

Further information regarding many of these collaborations are provided with the data regarding these collaborations in section 2R5. Key considerations in the decision to establish these partnerships include the consistency of partnership goals with the mission and priorities of the College and the adequacy of resources to sustain the partnership. The College prioritizes collaborations by the extent to which they support and align with Sinclair’s strategic priorities and operational and management goals. When specialized grant funding is involved, the Grants Office conducts an evaluation to assess the viability and value of potential partnerships requiring grant development in terms of whether they strategically advance the mission of the College using the following criteria:

- Sinclair’s strengths and/or weaknesses in the area of the proposed collaboration
- Likelihood of the partnership to complement and advance the work of the College and not create undue demand on college resources
- Sinclair’s ability to sustain the relationship with the partner after the conclusion of the project or grant
- Senior level leaders sign all collaboration agreements to assure alignment with strategic priorities and integration with other institutional priorities.

What are the results for determining the effectiveness of aligning and building collaborations and partnerships?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Given the large number of collaborative relationships that Sinclair has developed over the years, a tremendous amount of feedback has been received regarding stakeholders’ needs. Figure 2.32 provides data that is routinely gathered regarding collaborative relationships with stakeholders. Other examples of collaborative relationships follow Figure 2.32.

Examples of Data Gathered for Collaborative Relationships with Stakeholders:

Miami Valley Tech Prep Consortium: Several years ago state funding was removed from the Tech Prep Consortium. Unlike many institutions across the state, Sinclair opted to continue funding the program, allowing many area high school students to get a jump start on their college education. Figure 2.33 displays enrollment figures for Tech Prep.

Fast Forward Program: The Center focuses on reclaiming high school dropouts and providing them alternative educational environments in which to earn their high school diplomas or GEDs. In twelve years, 2,876 former dropouts have received their high school diplomas. The Fast Forward Center enrollment and graduate data are shown in Figure 2.34 and Figure 2.35.

Several years ago this program received national recognition as a 2010 Bellwether Award finalist.
David H. Ponitz Career Technology Center:
The David H. Ponitz Career Technology Center is a secondary institution developed in close partnership with Sinclair and named for a former president of Sinclair. Located less than a mile from Sinclair’s Dayton Campus, the Ponitz Center is the result of an innovative collaboration between Dayton Public Schools and Sinclair. Dayton Public High School seniors who attend Ponitz Career Technology Center have the opportunity to pursue college studies at Sinclair, simultaneously completing their final year of high school and earning dual credit for their freshman year of college. In addition to their regularly scheduled classes, students participate in a customized academic enriched support program to ensure their success. Figure 2.36 shows the most recently available outcome measures for the Ponitz Center.
Transfer Colleges and Universities Chosen by Sinclair Students: Figure 2.37 shows the number of new students choosing to begin at Sinclair and then transfer to a four-year college or university. As shown below, Sinclair students transfer to Wright State University (WSU) most frequently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE NAME</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark State Community College</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati State Technical and Community College</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State Community College</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison State Community College</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering College</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Wesleyan University</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin University</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Student Clearinghouse, academic years 2008-09 to 2012-13. Students' first enrollment at an institution other than Sinclair that occurs after first enrolling at Sinclair is counted (i.e. subsequent enrollment).

Articulation and Transfer Advisory: Sinclair is an active participant on Ohio’s Articulation and Transfer Advisory Council, which is overseen by the Ohio Board of Regents. This group provides counsel to the Board of Regents regarding transfer issues, including those related to the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM). The Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) represents a transfer core of courses universally transferable to public community colleges and universities by law in the State of Ohio. As can be seen in Figure 2.39, since the early 2000s, Sinclair’s rates of completion of the OTM have increased dramatically, allowing more students to seamless move credits between Ohio public colleges and universities. At least some of the increase is attributable to an effort to better ensure that transfer degrees entail completion of the transfer module as part of the curriculum.

United Way: Sinclair has traditionally been a strong supporter of United Way, running an Annual employee campaign that has raised hundreds of thousands of dollars over the years. Figure 2.39 displays the amount of money raised in these United Way campaigns in comparison to two area universities.

Project Read: Since July 1990, Project READ has been located at Sinclair. Supported by donations from businesses, foundations, private contributors, and the United Way, Project READ is a coalition of public and private organizations working together to build skilled workers, strong families, and healthy communities through improved literacy through classes in Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Education Development (GED), English for Speakers of
MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

Other Languages (ESOL), and other literacy classes. Through Project READ, over 100 Dayton area literacy organizations, schools and businesses are committed to building literacy in the Miami Valley. **Figure 2.40** displays the number of Project READ adult learner referrals over the past several years. Over this time period approximately 65% of the referrals in **Figure 2.40** were to GED classes held at Sinclair’s Dayton campus.

**Sinclair Grants Office:** One powerful measure of engagement with external stakeholders is the number of grants and awards that Sinclair received annually. Sinclair’s award-winning Grants Office helped the College obtain many high profile grants in recent years, including Completion by Design (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation), Connect 4 Completion (U.S. Department of Education), and Accelerate IT (U.S. Department of Labor) as described in 1P5. **Figure 2.41** lists the amount of money Sinclair has been awarded by grants over time. Over the past four years (FY 2010 - 2014), Sinclair’s Grants Office has obtained nearly $40 million ($39,789,911) to support Sinclair’s teaching, learning, and completion initiatives. Of this amount, nearly $17 million ($16,795,515) supported Sinclair’s major four completion programs — Accelerate IT, Completion by Design, City Connects, and Connect 4 Completion.

**Based on 2R5, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?**

The grant opportunities that Sinclair has pursued in recent years have been discussed extensively in previous sections — a detailed summary is provided in section 1P5. In the past few years, these grant-funded initiatives have greatly expanded the number and scope of Sinclair’s major partnerships.

The Completion by Design grant involved a close partnership with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The grant also stipulated the formation of a cadre of higher education institutions prior to applying for the grant. As the managing partner for the grant, Sinclair partnered with Lorain Community College and Stark State College to form the Ohio cadre, with extensive collaboration among the institutions in the cadre.

The $12 million dollar Department of Labor TAACCCT grant called Accelerate IT at Sinclair, funded Sinclair as the national lead with a consortium of higher education institutions including Broward College and Austin Community College implementing the Western Governors University competency-based education (CBE) model in community colleges. With extensive collaborations built into the grant design, in June 2015 more partnerships will be established at the inaugural CC4CBE (Community Colleges for Competency Based Education) conference.

Additionally, Sinclair is partnering with the Mathile Family Foundation and City Connects to adapt the City Connects model of student support to the community college setting.

These partnerships have emerged in recent years, and the focus of Sinclair’s efforts in the next three years will be further alignment and integration of the initiatives that these partnerships involve. Each of these initiatives is extensive, and the associated partnerships involve a considerable investment of Sinclair resources.
AQIP CATEGORY THREE: VALUING EMPLOYEES

CATEGORY INTRODUCTION
Sinclair has robust, well-established hiring processes that ensure that positions are filled by skilled, qualified employees. An online application process filters in qualified candidates, with search committees providing further review to ensure that only qualified applicants are allowed through to final interviews for a position. New Hire Orientation is provided to help new employees to understand Sinclair processes and become acclimated to Sinclair culture. New adjunct faculty participate in the Adjunct Faculty Certification course to assist in their transition into their new teaching responsibilities at Sinclair.

All faculty at Sinclair – regardless of modality or location of the section that they teach – must meet Higher Learning Commission and Ohio Board of Regents credentialing requirements at the time that they are hired to teach at Sinclair. Adherence to these requirements ensures that instructors at Sinclair are qualified in the eyes of regional accreditors and state education officials.

As a result of collaboration between the Provost and Faculty Senate, Sinclair has set a 50/50 ratio of full-time to part-time payload hours as a guide to faculty staffing. Maintaining this ratio at the institutional level is a priority, and guides staffing decisions that are made to ensure that the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities. For non-faculty employees, first-line managers are responsible for ensuring that their areas are adequately staffed. Established processes allow managers to fill or create new positions as new staffing needs arise.

Full-time faculty participate in the Faculty/Administrative Performance Review (FAPR) annually as a means of evaluating their performance in scholarships and professional growth, teaching and learning facilitation, assessment and evaluation, student development, curriculum development and design, and workplace and community service. Chairpersons give faculty ratings in these areas which determine increases in salary. In addition, Sinclair provides Merit Awards for faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching and other academic endeavors related to the College’s mission.

As part of an AQIP Action Project, in recent years the institution has implemented a new evaluation system for non-faculty employees, the eAppraisal system. eAppraisal provides an online, electronic format for employees to rate themselves and supervisors to rate employees in a way that collaboratively identifies areas of high performance and opportunities for improvement. This system also allows employees and supervisors to work together to develop goals for continuous improvement, and to monitor these goals throughout the year.

Sinclair’s Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is an excellent resource for professional development of both faculty and staff. With an impressive list of activities and opportunities, it is truly a model of how an institution can make an investment in the professional development of its faculty that pays rich dividends. The establishment and enhancement of the CTL is attributable to a notable increase in recent years in PACE survey ratings regarding the feelings of faculty that professional development opportunities are available to them.

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF PROCESSES FOR CATEGORY 3: INTEGRATED

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF RESULTS FOR CATEGORY 3: INTEGRATED

CATEGORY RESPONSES VALUING EMPLOYEES

3P1 Hiring focuses on the acquisition of appropriately qualified/credentialed faculty, staff, and administrators to ensure that effective, high-quality programs and student support services are provided. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Recruiting, hiring, and orienting employees

When a position becomes open or the need for a new position is identified, the department involved initiates the request for the position to be either created or filled through Sinclair’s Office of Human Resources (HR). This request must be approved by the department head, the next level supervisor and ultimately by the appropriate senior vice president, and is then submitted as a requisition via the On-Line Job Posting Site. Prior to publishing the position vacancy, HR representatives meet with the department manager and/or search committee to determine appropriate advertising venues, timelines, and the legal issues in hiring. Hiring processes follow all federal and state guidelines. Advertising is primarily done through Sinclair’s online job posting site, which can be accessed via the following link: jobs.sinclair.edu. When a prospective applicant finds a job on this website that they are interested in applying for, they must create an account and enter some basic information before they are even allowed to apply for a job, which is the beginning of the screening process. While Sinclair often publicizes openings via national publications, local newspapers, minority publications, professional organizations, internet web boards, and job fairs, applicants must go through the jobs.sinclair.edu website to apply for a position at Sinclair.
As an applicant applies for a job through the website, the online application process initially screens applicants for minimum required skills, experiences, and credentials. Search committees, comprised of individuals from different departments at Sinclair who are familiar with the position, review the application materials of all applicants who meet minimum requirements, interview candidates and recommend finalists to the hiring manager. Sinclair’s Office of Human Resources (HR) trains search committee members in college policy and procedure for searches. The committee selects and interviews a smaller number of finalists from the list of qualified candidates who are generally expected to provide evidence of skill through demonstrations, presentations and/or portfolios. Senior leadership positions also require open-forum discussions with all levels of the institution where feedback is collected to better inform the search committee’s final recommendations. Reference checks and criminal background checks are part of every search. Once hired, new full-time employees are oriented by participating in New Hire Orientation, and all faculty and staff are provided access to college handbooks which describe policies, practices and procedures. Adjunct (part-time) faculty complete New Adjunct Faculty Orientation and are logged into a comprehensive Learning Management System community through which they have access to resources such as emergency procedures, important phone numbers, FERPA, sexual harassment policy, grade posting policies, etc. There is also a mentoring program for all new adjuncts, and adjuncts teaching a particular course for the first time.

- **Designing hiring processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills, and values (3.C.6)**

Hiring managers determine skills, values and credentialing requirements that are aligned with existing departmental and/or institutional objectives at the time of the job creation and/or posting, and these requirements are listed in the Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ). This tool requires a position be built on three components: know how, problem solving requirements and accountability. Credentialing will vary based on the position and is usually determined by benchmarking with already existing similar positions within the institution (if available) or with external agencies and institutions. In some instances, accreditation(s) may drive credentialing requirements (addresses Core component 3.C.6).

The hiring manager develops screening questions based on the PDQ requirements at the time that the manager enters the requisition into the online system for the position. Hiring managers have the ability to create screening questions that disqualify applicants from further consideration as they are initially applying for the position if they do not meet these requirements. After applicants have completed the on-line application process, HR provides the search committee members with access to their application materials and the requisite qualifications for the position. Applicants who are invited for interviews are further screened by the search committee to determine that they are properly qualified, and any applicants who are not qualified are not furthered by the search committee to the hiring manager for further consideration. A limited number of candidates are forwarded to the hiring manager for the second round of interviews, providing another level of review to ensure that those who are hired possess the required qualifications, skills, and values (addresses Core component 3.C.6).

- **Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)**

Credentialing standards for faculty at Sinclair are derived from two sources: Higher Learning Commission Assumed Practices and Ohio Board of Regents Guidelines and Procedures for Program Approval. According to the Higher Learning Commission Assumed Practices B.2.a:

**Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) possess an academic degree relevant to what they are teaching and at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established. In terminal degree programs, faculty members possess the same level of degree. When faculty members are employed based on equivalent experience, the institution defines a minimum threshold of experience and an evaluation process that is used in the appointment process.**

Since Sinclair offers no terminal degree programs, the standard that all faculty possess an academic degree “at least one level above the level at which they teach” is rigidly enforced. (addresses Core components 3.C.1 and 3.C.2).

Sinclair also strictly adheres to Ohio Board of Regents’ faculty credentialing requirements as set forth in the Ohio Board of Regents’ Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review (available at [www.ohiohighered.org/academic-program-approval](http://www.ohiohighered.org/academic-program-approval)). The current version of the Guidelines and Procedures mandates requirements for faculty credentials, which include the following:

**Faculty Credentials**

The following expectations apply to all full-time and part-time instructors, including graduate teaching assistants and high school teachers who serve as adjunct faculty members for dual enrollment courses.

1) **For general education courses:**

Faculty members teaching general education courses must hold a master’s degree in the discipline or a master’s degree and a cohesive set of at least 18 semester credit hours of graduate coursework relevant to the discipline.

2) **For courses other than general education courses:**
Faculty members must hold a terminal degree or a degree at least one level above the degree level in which they are teaching:

- At least a bachelor's degree if teaching in an associate degree program

3) The following expectations apply to all faculty members:

- Faculty members must hold a degree from a regionally or nationally accredited institution recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or equivalent as verified by a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services.

4) The following expectations apply to faculty members teaching developmental education courses:

- Faculty must possess one of the following:
  - either a bachelor's or master's degree in Education, with an emphasis on teaching mathematics or reading or composition
  - a bachelor's or master's degree and experience teaching literacy or numeracy to adolescents or adults

5) Exceptions

Certain individuals may be qualified to teach college-level courses yet not meet the faculty qualification criteria presented here. In such circumstances, it is the responsibility of each institution's chief academic officer to make decisions in consultation with program faculty regarding exceptions and to maintain a record of the justification of those exceptions. Documentation that could be used to support exceptions may include, but is not limited to: publications, licensure, certification, evidence of years of professional experience and/or professional reputation.

6) Responsibility for determining faculty qualifications

Chief academic officers are ultimately responsible for ensuring the following: a) that faculty credentialing requirements are met; b) that instructors who are working toward meeting credentialing requirements are appropriately mentored and making substantial progress in their coursework; c) that exceptions to the requirements are carefully considered and justified; and d) that exceptions are reserved for a small number of uniquely qualified individuals.

Sinclair ensures that all faculty meet the criteria cited above. Instructors in dual enrollment arrangements are held to the same standards, and must meet the same credentialing requirements as other faculty members as specified in the Guidelines and Procedures. Department chairs are held accountable to ensure that the above requirements are met by all Sinclair instructors, regardless of the location or modality of the section being offered (addresses Core component 3.C.2).

- Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities (3.C.1)

Sinclair has worked to maintain a 50/50 ratio between full-time and adjunct faculty in terms of instructional payload hours for the past several years, with agreement from the Faculty Issues Team (FIT) and the Faculty Senate. As positions in an academic department come open due to retirement or faculty otherwise transitioning from Sinclair, decisions regarding whether the position will be replaced are made in the context of this 50/50 ratio that has been agreed upon between faculty and administration.

In all considerations regarding faculty staffing and the ratio, it is recognized that departments require a core staffing of tenure-track faculty to ensure that non-classroom programs and activities are perpetuated. The size of the department, the number of students enrolled in programs, the scope and type of non-classroom programs and activities, and any program accreditation requirements are all taken into careful consideration when determining whether a department has an appropriate number of full-time tenure track faculty relative to the number of full-time ACFs. In recent years there have been multiple cases where a department experienced enrollment growth that justified the creation of new tenure-track faculty positions (addresses Core component 3.C.1).

- Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services

Front-line managers determine the appropriate numbers of student support services staff, in consultation with the next level supervisor and the appropriate senior vice president. In some cases, seasonal, temporary employees may be needed in areas where demand ebbs and flows throughout the term, as is the case in the Bookstore. In these situations, employees are brought on and trained for a limited period of time during which the need is greatest. In other areas, where demand for services remains less variable across the year, managers are responsible to ensure that there is an appropriate number of staff available to meet student needs, and if more are needed to make requests for additional positions through the appropriate channels.

3R1 What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring, and orienting practices assure effective provision for programs and services?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained
There is only a limited amount of data available that would provide insight as to whether current recruitment, hiring, and orienting practices are effectively providing for programs and services. One important piece of information comes from the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE), which is administered to employees at Sinclair every three years and was most recently administered in 2013. The purpose of the survey is to obtain the perceptions of employees concerning the College climate. According to PACE, college climates vary from “coercive” to “competitive” to “consultative” to “collaborative” environment the most desirable because of the balance between and among productivity, job satisfaction, communication, and overall organizational climate variables.

There were 1,059 Sinclair employees who responded to the survey in the most recent administration. One question on PACE asks respondents to rate “the extent to which workload demands are equitable for college members with the same job title/description” on a 5 point scale (1 = lowest, 5 = highest). Figure 3.1 compares mean ratings on this item across the past several administrations of PACE. The increase in ratings across years would seem to indicate that over time employees have increased in level of agreement that the number of employees is adequate to meet the workload demands made of them.

Another item on PACE asks respondents to rate “the extent to which the amount of work I do is appropriate”. Responses to this item across the past several administrations are displayed in Figure 3.2. Once again, the increase seen in 2013 would seem to indicate that over time employees have become more likely to feel that workload is appropriate, which would imply that they feel that sufficient employees exist to support the college’s programs in their area.

These results would seem to indicate that since 2007 employees have been more likely to agree that job demands are equitable and that they amount of work that they are doing is appropriate. These survey results provide evidence that programs and services are being appropriately staffed, in that overall employees are not reporting that work demands are unequitable or that they are being tasked with inappropriate amounts of work. Moreover, results from the same survey indicate that employees feel that both faculty and non-teaching professional personnel are meeting the needs of students, as can be seen in Figure 3.3 and Figure 3.4. It appears that employees feel that both faculty and non-teaching personnel are meeting students’ needs to a greater extent that was the case in the 2007 administration of PACE, which provides evidence that effective provision is being made by Sinclair for programs and services in terms of staffing. These results do not indicate that there is widespread concern that programs and services at Sinclair are suffering from inadequate or insufficient staffing.

Taking a more global look at employee satisfaction at Sinclair, overall PACE Survey results have generally had high ratings over the past several administrations of the survey, consistently higher than that of the PACE norm group, as can be seen in Figure 3.5.

Figure 3.6 provides a graphic comparison of Sinclair PACE results relative to the PACE norm group in the 2013 administration of the survey, and demonstrates that Sinclair’s results are consistently closer to the “Collaborative” level than the norm group. Moreover, similar to the norm group, the highest
ratings were in the “Student Focus” area and the lowest were in “Institutional Structure”, indicating that Sinclair’s strengths and weaknesses in its climate are similar to its peers.

PACE provided indications that Sinclair employees think very highly of their work environment in terms of relationships with supervisors and co-workers. For every item in the “Supervisory Relationship” and “Teamwork” PACE categories, Sinclair ratings were statistically significantly higher than that of the norm group, as can be seen in Figures 3.7 and 3.8.

Sinclair employees also express more satisfaction relative to the Norm Base regarding promotion of diversity in the workplace and the importance of student diversity, as indicated by ratings to the questions displayed in Figure 3.10.

Overall satisfaction of Sinclair employees is further evidenced by the relatively low turnover rates, as displayed in Figure 3.11. Historically Sinclair has had a very low turnover rate see, due in part to the College’s comprehensive
FIGURE 3.9 PACE RESULTS OF PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFECTIVENESS BY EMPLOYMENT CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which my supervisor helps me to improve my work</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which actions of this institution reflect its mission</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3.10 SINCLAIR EMPLOYEE RATINGS ON PACE DIVERSITY QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3.11 SINCLAIR TURNOVER RATES

Benefit package, competitive salaries, a culture of appreciation and mutual respect, organizational development, opportunities for advancement, and a safe and appealing working environment. Figure 3.11 also indicates that Sinclair has experienced an unusually high number of employee retirements over the past two years. The majority of the retirements are due to the long-term tenure of Sinclair employees coupled with the changes to the State Pension Systems. Sinclair has long benefited from a loyal, experienced and long-tenured workforce. The 1970s, 80s and 90s saw consistent growth for Sinclair both in student and employee numbers. The concurrent longevity of so many employees now creates a higher than normal retirement bubble for Sinclair. Changes to Ohio's pension systems have also provided incentive for some seasoned employees to retire at the end of the 2012 and 2013 Academic Years. Coupled with the retirement age eligibility of this long-tenured group, Sinclair has experienced a larger than usual number of retirements and thus subsequent replacement hiring activity.

311 Based on 3R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

There are currently no plans for improvements in recruitment, hiring, and orienting practices. The available data indicates that Sinclair employees feel that the current practices are adequate for meeting the needs of students through our programs and services. Sinclair will continue to monitor employee feedback via PACE every three years to determine whether revisions to recruitment, hiring, and orientation practices are appropriate.

However, since no data exists as to how well newly hired employees feel that New Hire Orientation is meeting their needs, it may be a good idea to begin getting feedback from employees at the conclusion of orientation, or perhaps after they have been on the job for some period of time to assess the effectiveness of the orientation.
EVALUATION AND RECOGNITION

Evaluation and Recognition focuses on processes that assess and recognize faculty, staff, and administrators’ contributions to the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees
- Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff, and administrators
- Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services
- Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff, and administrators (3.C.3)

Sinclair administrators design evaluation systems with input from senior leadership, supervisors, faculty and staff from across the College, as well as from review of best practices at other institutions. The personnel evaluation systems used by Sinclair are designed to provide feedback to employees on the level at which they are accomplishing their job functions. They also provide opportunities for employees to work with their supervisors to define a set of actions which can translate into continuous improvement. Sinclair utilizes separate evaluation systems for faculty and non-faculty employees.

Faculty evaluation

The Sinclair Faculty Handbook (www.sinclair.edu/about/pub/faculty_handbook.pdf) provides the following description of the process for evaluating full-time faculty performance via the Faculty/Administrative Performance Review (FAPR) process:

Evaluation of Faculty

It is the policy of the college to have a two-part faculty evaluation system: Part One, The Faculty/Administrative Performance Review (FAPR), which indicates whether the individual is performing at a proficient level and which every faculty member must undergo; and Part Two, The Merit Determination System, which determines if an individual is performing at an outstanding level (Merit Status). Faculty members participate in the Merit Determination System only if they choose to do so.

According to the Handbook, the FAPR is conducted by the chairperson or dean of the faculty member on a regular basis:

A Faculty/Administrative Performance Review (FAPR), based on a standardized procedure according to the Timing and Action Calendar (Section B.1), will be conducted. It is the intent of this evaluation procedure to improve the effectiveness of the person being evaluated and to provide the basis for recommendations involving contracts (renewal or nonrenewal), salary considerations, tenure, and promotion in academic rank.

The evaluator will be the department chairperson – except for the department chairperson, who will be evaluated by the dean – and the evaluation will be conducted on a face-to-face basis with each faculty member...

...The Overall Rating is the collective assessment of the FAPR and will be a determinant for contract, tenure, promotion, and salary considerations.

All faculty with a Proficient Rating shall be recommended for the same increase in salary. All faculty with an Unsatisfactory Rating will receive no increase in salary.

The Faculty Handbook also specifies how input is solicited from faculty on changes to the FAPR process and how the expectations are communicated to them:

Changes in the Guidelines for the conduct of the FAPR are prepared by Department Chairpersons Council, subject to approval by the Faculty Assembly, Instructional Council, President of the college (or his/her designee) and the Board of Trustees. These guidelines will be made available to all faculty and evaluators prior to the evaluation.

The schedule for administering FAPRs differs somewhat between non-tenured and tenured faculty. Non-tenured faculty is formally evaluated once each year and tenured faculty evaluated on a three year cycle of one formal and two interim evaluations.

It should be noted that a group of faculty in collaboration with Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office recently revised the current FAPR process. Figure 3.12 lists the six Critical Performance Areas (CPAs) related to faculty performance in the FAPR in this recent revision. The minimum number of CPAs that a faculty member must be rated in is determined by faculty rank:

- Instructor – required to be rated in CPAs 1, 2 and 3
- Assistant Professor – required to be rated in CPAs 1, 2, 3, 4
- Associate Professor – required to be rated in CPAs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 or 6
- Professor – required to be rated in CPAs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6

For each Critical Performance Area, faculty are given a rating of “Unsatisfactory”, “Below Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, or “Exceeds Expectations. Based on these ratings, an overall rating using the same framework is given. Figure 3.13 specifies the consequences associated with the overall ratings.
For adjunct faculty, the Adjunct Faculty Handbook states the following regarding instructor evaluation:

Evaluation of the performance of adjunct faculty is the responsibility of the department chair. Feedback from students through the term class survey will be included, along with feedback from mentors. The Office of Adjunct Faculty Support Services provides the student survey forms, along with procedures for administering the surveys. Surveys must be completed for every course taught during the fall and spring terms. A summary of the student survey results is available to adjunct faculty following completion of the term.

Adjunct faculty have the opportunity to progress from Lecturer I status, which is what they are hired at, to Lecturer II status. Adjunct faculty can request Advancement from Lecturer I to Lecturer II if they have taught nine hours and completed the Adjunct Faculty Certification Course through Sinclair’s Center for Teaching and Learning.

Non-faculty evaluation

Non-faculty employees are evaluated using a system that was developed a number of years ago as part of an AQIP Action Project, “Employee Performance Evaluation System”, which was initially conceived during the AQIP Strategy Forum preceding the initiation of the project in October 2009. The need for an improved employee evaluation and development system was rated the highest priority for change among support staff, professional staff and administrators in both the 2004 and 2007 administrations of the PACE survey. Supervisors and managers indicated a desire for improved performance evaluation processes that would provide a more substantive review and a better link to planning for professional development and succession planning for their staff. In 2009, the Office of Human Resources commissioned a consultant to design a two-phase project to survey leadership to determine perceptions of HR effectiveness and to assess the processes for effectiveness and efficiency in the operations. The resultant project involved...
the development of a new “eAppraisal” system for employee evaluation. The goal of this project was to design a new on-line performance evaluation system to promote consistency and simplicity for evaluators and those employees being evaluated. The system consists of components that measure actual job performance, outcomes, and performance development and professional growth. The tool allows employees to quickly see next steps that must be taken in the process and the goals that the employee has committed to for the year.

Initiated in 2012, the eAppraisal has become well-established as the process for employee performance evaluation. It allows for capturing narratives, comments and documentation throughout the year, and has an interface that is user-friendly and intuitive. Input from the employee, the first level supervisor, and the second level supervisor are all brought together to inform employee performance evaluation, and the results are connected to annual compensation actions in a way that allows employees to see how performance evaluations are tied to pay increases.

In May of each year employees use the eAppraisal tool to rate themselves as “exceptional,” “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectation,” “below expectations,” or “needs improvement” on the following performance factors:

- Personal Attributes
- Initiative
- Organizational Awareness
- College Commitment
- Building Team Environment
- Customer Focus
- Change Management
- Diversity
- Empowering Employees
- Managing Employee Performance

Employees also give themselves an overall rating based on assessment of performance on accountabilities listed in the Position Description Questionnaire, and there is also an opportunity to specify goals for the year. After employees have made their self-ratings in the tool, first-line supervisors log in and provide their ratings for the employee in these areas. The employee and the first-line supervisor then meet one-on-one to compare ratings and discuss whether any adjustments to ratings or goals need to be made prior to second-line supervisor review and approval. First- and second-line supervisors take these ratings into consideration when specifying salary increases for employees for the following year, and employees whose overall ratings are too low are ineligible for salary increases.

Employees and first-line managers have required “coaching sessions” midway through the year to update information in the eAppraisal and to discuss progress towards goals and overall employee performance to date in the year.

HR provides training for employees and supervisors each month in the use of the eAppraisal tool to allow employees in new positions the opportunity to learn the process, and to offer other employees an opportunity to re-familiarize themselves with the process.

- Establishing employee recognition, compensation, and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance
- Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement

In addition to the Faculty/Administrative Performance Review process described in the previous section, faculty also have the option of applying for the Merit Determination System. After the President has approved the Faculty/Administrative Performance Reviews, each full-time tenure-track faculty member who worked for the two previous semesters – Spring and Fall – and received a Proficient rating is eligible to apply for a Merit Award.

There are two avenues through which faculty may apply for a Merit Award: Division Merit or Collegewide Merit. Provisions of these Merit Awards include:

- The merit application is for performance during the period of January 1 through December 31.
- A faculty member can receive only one Merit Award in a calendar year.
- A Division Merit Award enables each academic division to recommend approximately 10% of its division faculty to be deemed meritorious.
- A Collegewide Merit determination process allows for approximately 45% of the college faculty to be deemed meritorious.
- Each year the total number of Merit Awards is not to exceed 55% of the total number of faculty (10% Division Merit and 45% Collegewide Merit).

The Merit Award is at least three percent of the average base salary for the prior year, and is not included in the faculty member’s base pay. No more than 55% of the college’s full-time faculty may be awarded merit bonuses, which makes it truly a competitive reward.

Other recognition opportunities for faculty are provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning, including awards for excellence in teaching. Details regarding these recognition opportunities can be found in section 3P3.

For non-faculty employees, the eAppraisal system bases pay increases on ratings provided through collaboration between employees and first-line supervisors. In addition, each August non-faculty employees have the opportunity to earn a bonus based on two factors:

- Job performance as indicated by the eAppraisal process
- Institutional performance as measured by various Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

If eAppraisal results are not satisfactory, or if the institution overall fails to meet its Key Performance Indicators, then the bonus pay is not provided for the employee.
What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees’ contributions to the institution?

- Outcomes/measure tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

The Provost’s Office prepares an annual report for the Board of Trustees detailing results of the Faculty/Administrative Performance Review (FAPR) each year. Figure 3.14 displays key findings from these reports for the past several years.

### Figure 3.14

**RESULTS FOR FACULTY/ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FACULTY/ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2010 | • 310 FAPR’s completed  
• 10 first-year reviews were completed  
• All faculty received a satisfactory rating overall |
| 2011 | • 308 FAPR’s completed  
• 23 first-year reviews were completed  
• Two faculty were evaluated as “Unsatisfactory” |
| 2012 | • 317 FAPR’s completed  
• 169 formal reviews and 148 interim reviews  
• 52 faculty piloted a new version of the FAPR  
• All faculty received a satisfactory rating overall |
| 2013 | • 300 FAPR’s completed  
• 147 faculty piloted a new format, with the option to re-do using the old format if it proved more favorable. Three faculty opted to revert to the old format after using the new one.  
• Of the three faculty who reverted from the new to the old format, one had a rating change from “Below Expectations” to “Proficient”, and the other two went from “Meets Expectations” to “Proficient”. This would seem to indicate that the new format is more stringent than the old one. A result of the change in format for these three faculty, all faculty received a satisfactory rating overall |
| 2014 | • 288 FAPR’s completed  
• 170 formal reviews and 118 interim reviews  
• All faculty received a satisfactory rating overall |

Figure 3.15 displays the number of full-time tenure track faculty members receiving Merit Awards in the past five years:

### Figure 3.15

**NUMBER OF FACULTY RECEIVING MERIT AWARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division Merit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegewide Merit</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For non-faculty employees, after establishing the eAppraisal process, in early 2014 Human Resources conducted follow-up research gathering data from college employees regarding what worked well in the eAppraisal process and where improvements could be made. HR then took this focus group feedback and used it to modify the process. Figure 3.16 displays the feedback that was received from the focus groups and the steps that were taken to use that data to make improvements.

### Figure 3.16

**FEEDBACK FROM EAPPRAISAL FOCUS GROUPS AND ACTIONS TAKEN AS A RESULT**

#### FEEDBACK REGARDING WHAT WORKS WELL IN THE EAPPRAISAL PROCESS:

- Likes that it is electronic
- Don’t have to email and make copies
- More concrete and focused
- Great Accessibility
- Can cut and paste
- Goals drop in form automatically
- Due dates are helpful
- Shows dates when you have made changes or accessed
- Spell check is useful
- Allows you to edit goals

#### FEEDBACK REGARDING IMPROVEMENTS THAT COULD BE MADE IN THE EAPPRAISAL PROCESS:

- To many signatures required and the appraisal form goes back and forth
- No connection to the PDQ
- Need more detailed Instructions with screen shots in the reminder emails
- More training needed for supervisors
- Topic specific training
- Need to revise some of the definitions
- Need to evaluate the 5 point scale

#### ACTIONS FROM HR AS A RESULT OF THE FEEDBACK:

- Changed the workflow to reduce the number of signatures thereby speeding up the approval process of the appraisal form
- Improved our reminder emails by adding in screen shots to demonstrate the required actions
- Edited some of the definitions for performance factors to align better with Sinclair’s mission
- Added more training and included more drop in sessions for employees and managers during the appraisal completion period
- Stared the process with IT to create a link to the Position Description so that it will be integrated and visible from the system
- We are evaluating the 5 point system

PACE also provides feedback on performance evaluation processes at Sinclair. Figure 3.17 displays ratings for the item “the extent to which I receive appropriate feedback for my work”, broken out by responses from administrative, faculty, professional, and support employees. Note that there was a general trend for increases across years for all groups for this item, and the lowest mean rating was still fairly high at 3.88 for support employees, indicating a high level of agreement across all groups.

Similar high ratings were given for receiving timely feedback across the four groups, as can be seen in Figure 3.18.
Respondents expressed similarly high levels of agreement that unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to employees, as evidenced in Figure 3.19.

The extremely high ratings for the item regarding the extent to which supervisors express confidence in employees' work displayed in Figure 3.20 should be noted. This is a clear indication that in general employees at Sinclair feel valued and supported by those who manage them.

Additional findings from PACE for the past three years are provided in Figure 3.21.

**Performance Evaluation Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on 3R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The current FAPR process for evaluating faculty performance is relatively new – while select faculty have piloted the process for several years, in the previous year faculty had the option of using this new process instead of the old one, and it is only with the current year that the process became fully implemented. Because it is still a relatively new process, the Provost's Office will be closely monitoring how well it is working and whether there are adjustments that need to be made.

One change that will be made in the FAPR process is that an electronic, online process will replace the current process that requires the submission of hard-copy documents. Sinclair's Instructional Technology Department began working on the online system in early 2015, and hopes to have it ready to be utilized as the FAPR process begins in Fall 2015. Migrating to an electronic-based process should be more efficient and generate cost savings after the elimination of printing hard-copy documents.

Feedback was obtained early in 2014 for the eAppraisal process, and adjustments were made accordingly. As noted in Figure 3.16, questions were raised regarding the five point scale used for ratings, and Human Resources continues to consider whether the rating scale should be modified. Additional feedback on how well the process is working will be sought in the future.

One area where Sinclair could consider making improvements would be the establishment of an adjunct faculty evaluation system. Currently many adjuncts complete the Adjunct Faculty Certification course taught through the Center for Teaching and Learning, and many of them use this to progress from Lecturer I to Lecturer II status. All adjuncts participate in the End of Course Student Survey, and chairpersons have access to the feedback received through that process. However, there is no structure for adjunct faculty evaluation beyond this. There is not currently a campus-wide process for evaluating adjunct faculty instruction - departments are charged with overseeing adjuncts but no structure is in place providing a uniform evaluation of their teaching. Departments have informal ways of assessing the quality of the instruction of their adjunct faculty, and it is likely that standards that must be met vary considerably depending on the department. Sinclair may want to explore a more structured approach to evaluation of its adjunct faculty instruction.

DEVELOPMENT

Development focuses on processes for continually training, educating, and supporting employees to remain current in their methods and to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees (3.C.4, 5.A.4)
- Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4)

The Sinclair culture supports innovation through such initiatives as Learning Challenge Grants and the College's membership in the League for Innovation in the Community College. Faculty and staff are encouraged to participate in activities that promote learning, innovation and creativity, and have received numerous national recognitions of their innovation. Every year Sinclair sends around a dozen faculty and staff to present between five and seven presentations at the League for Innovation's Innovations Conference. Often these presentations involve collaboration between faculty and staff in various areas at the college (addresses Core component 3.C.4).

Sinclair is fortunate to have an excellent Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) (ctl.sinclair.edu/) to provide professional development opportunities for its faculty. According to the CTL Mission Statement

Our mission is to promote transformative teaching through collaboration and reflection to ensure Sinclair's diverse students have varied opportunities for developing their potential as members of the global community.

In support of this mission, the CTL staff includes a Director, who oversees the operations of the CTL and manages the Faculty Associate for Service Learning. For AY 2014-15, the staff also included an Assistant Director who spent the year working closely with the Director before transitioning into that role at the beginning of AY 2015-16.

Below is the CTL Vision Statement:
The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) fosters and sustains faculty development in the pursuit of exemplary practices in teaching and learning. The CTL goals include:

- **Classroom:** Encouraging innovation, classroom research, best practices, and discipline-specific and multi-disciplinary interaction.
- **Community:** Creating an opportunity for students, faculty, administration and the community to dialogue about teaching and learning.
- **Teaching assessment and peer review:** Teaching assessment and peer review to aid in the continuing development of faculty.
- **Mentoring:** Mentoring faculty to build learning communities and relationships between colleagues.
- **Resources:** Providing resources to support teaching and learning strategies.
- **Advocacy:** Promoting and advocating for teaching excellence.
All faculty are expected to participate in continuing professional development, and the CTL provides a diverse array of on-going professional development for faculty in support of the Critical Performance Areas (CPAs) (addresses Core components 3.C.4 and 5.A.4). Key activities of the CTL include:

- **Overseeing Sinclair’s Service Learning Office**, which promotes student utilization of Service Learning as an instructional pedagogy to enhance and engage students in community-based service tied to academic learning.

- **The Adjunct Faculty Certification Course**, which is offered several times throughout the year. The course is offered as a 6-hour workshop with online content and classroom observations completed within 5 weeks. Completion of this certification course along with teaching 9 payload hours will make an adjunct eligible to request the rank of Lecturer II.

- **At the end of each academic year, the Provost’s office along with the CTL celebrates faculty accomplishments in Teaching Excellence**. The CTL assists in the coordination of several major teaching awards on this campus including the John and Suanne Roueche League of Innovation Teaching Excellence Award, the Southern Ohio Consortium of Higher Education Award for Teaching Excellence (SOCHE), the Excellence in Course Related Service Learning Teaching Award, U.S. Professor of the Year Award, and the Adjunct Faculty Teaching Excellence Award. Over 30 faculty members were recognized at the most recent Provost’s annual recognition reception.

- **Faculty Professional Development Workshops and Conferences**. Workshops are designed by faculty and staff for faculty to address the most pertinent classroom concerns and current scholarship on teaching and learning. The majority of workshops are three hours. Current workshop offerings can be accessed at the following link: ctlevents.sinclair.edu/. In addition to the workshops, since its inception the Center for Teaching and Learning has offered intensive conferences each term featuring renowned experts in teaching and learning. In recent years it has been fortunate to host Stewart Ross, Barbara Millis, Tom Angelo, Craig Nelson, Stephen Brookfield, Elizabeth Barkley, Ken Bain, Michael Theall, Todd Zakrajsek, Karen Becker, and many others. These experts have shared best practices and inspired our faculty to continue to engage our students in the classroom.

- **The First Year Faculty Experience**, where first year faculty members participate in a professional development series designed to introduce new faculty to Sinclair policies and emphasize the importance of the best practices in teaching and learning. The First Year Faculty Experience workshops meet once each month during the academic year, and in addition to covering a variety of important topics, the regular meetings allow new full-time faculty an opportunity to form important connections with colleagues outside of their own academic departments.

- **The Sinclair Teaching Excellence Academy** is a particularly intensive development experience for qualified faculty leaders. This track is restricted to a small cohort of previous National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) award winners nominated by a division dean to participate. The purpose of this experience is to offer an opportunity for excellent faculty to come together as a cohort to focus on teaching and to think about faculty leadership. In order to be chosen to participate, faculty must make a commitment to attend the introductory meeting and all 6 sessions, including a weekend retreat. There are also a few additional non-required events throughout the year.

The Academy consists of six workshops held throughout the academic year. Each workshop may involve pre-reading, preparation, and follow-up assignments. There is no compensation for participating in this experience. The concluding workshop is held off-campus in a retreat setting.

- **CTL Professional Development Tracks**, which are similar to taking a graduate course in teaching and learning. Each track consists of at least three two or three-hour workshops per term. Tracks are offered on these subjects:
  - Student Engagement
  - Curriculum and Assessment
  - Mindfulness
  - Communication Across the Curriculum
  - Diversity and Inclusion
  - Integrating Technology
  - Office Tools for a Better Life
  - Education for Life
  - 3 D’s for Significant Learning

- **CTL Funding Opportunities for individual faculty**. Over the 2012-13 academic year a total of 108 faculty received $104,074 in funding for professional development. CTL Funding Opportunities include
  - Learning Challenge Grants
  - Course ReVision
  - Mini-Sabbaticals
  - Special Funding (Showcase Sinclair) for faculty presenting at a conference
  - Career Seminars (focused on attending local workshops)

Additionally, as chairpersons step down from the position or retire, the faculty members who step into these roles require training in the duties and responsibilities of department chairpersons. As an orientation exercise, throughout their first year new chairpersons attend monthly meetings of the New Chair Academy, where they are trained on course scheduling, accessing and using data, managing faculty, use of the Curriculum Management Tool, and a number of other responsibilities.
• Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.) (3.C.6)

Each division/department identifies training needs that are aligned with the strategic priorities. Individual CITs are then developed to complement the departmental, divisional or institutional objectives. Staff and administrators are trained and developed through several institutional venues, including the collaborative development of individual Continuous Improvement Targets (CITs) whereby employees and supervisors determine appropriate continuous improvement and training targets aligned with departmental, divisional or institutional needs (addresses Core components 3.C.6). In addition, the Staff Development and Innovation Committee (SDIC), composed of representatives from across the college, leads professional development planning for all staff.

Support staff participate regularly in professional development activities. One example comes from the Financial Aid office. For the past several years Sinclair has placed a considerable amount of time, effort, and resources into strengthening its Financial Aid office. As part of this effort, Financial Aid employees have spent an increased amount of time in training activities. Figure 3.22 displays the training activities and number of Financial Aid employees who participated in 2013 and 2014 (addresses Core components 3.C.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR/ SPONSORING ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FINANCIAL AID EMPLOYEES ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Media for the Financial Aid Office</td>
<td>Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA School Certifying Officials Workshop</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs</td>
<td>Bowling Green, OH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Student Aid Conference</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASFAA 2012 Winter Conference</td>
<td>Ohio Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (OASFAA)</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans in Higher Ed. Symposium</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Administrator Training</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASFAA 2013 Spring Conference</td>
<td>Ohio Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (OASFAA)</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellucian Live</td>
<td>Ellucian Higher Education</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training at Retreat</td>
<td>M. Moore, A. Cheek, A. Cheek</td>
<td>Aileron Retreat Ctr</td>
<td>All Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague FA Training (functional users)</td>
<td>E. Lane - Strata Information Group</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>All Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Student Aid Conference</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASFAA 2013 Winter Conference</td>
<td>Ohio Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (OASFAA)</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Administrator Training</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellucian Live Conference</td>
<td>Ellucian Higher Education</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASFAA 2014 Spring Conference</td>
<td>Ohio Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (OASFAA)</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASFAA Summer Institute</td>
<td>Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (MASFAA)</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptive Content: ImageNow 6.7 for Administrators</td>
<td>Perceptive Software</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Works Client Conference</td>
<td>AcademicWorks</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACEP National Conference</td>
<td>National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, Sinclair has an institutional membership to the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), and roughly half of the staff in the Financial Aid Office have individual memberships to the Ohio Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (OASFAA). For the last 6 years the Director of Financial Aid has served on OASFAA’s executive board, as co-chair, Treasurer, and most recently Vice President for Training.

- **Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives**

Skill development and organizational learning are attained, in part, through performance review processes that explicitly require and recognize continuous learning and are aligned with employee evaluation processes. Sinclair incentivizes employee participation in professional development by tying the Faculty/Administrative Performance Review (FAPR) and eAppraisal goals to professional development activities in ways that align with the institution’s objectives. For example, one way of demonstrating that faculty are at the level of “Exceed Expectations” in the six areas faculty are evaluated in during the FAPR process (see Figure 3.12) is by participating in professional development activities. These six areas were specifically chosen to align with institutional objectives, and placing them in the FAPR provides a powerful motivation for faculty to seek professional development in these areas.

Faculty and staff professional development days help advance employee growth. Skill sharing and organizational development are also reinforced through mentoring processes, presentations of best practices, and through brown bag conversations (informal lunch time open-invitation discussions).

Individualized professional development is encouraged for non-faculty in the eAppraisal process. As employees develop goals and Continuous Improvement Targets, the first-line supervisor often recommends specific professional development activities as a means for achieving these goals.

**What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development?**

- **Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized**

- **Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)**

- **Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks**

- **Interpretation of results and insights gained**

The PACE survey includes an item that directly addresses professional development opportunities for employees. Figure 3.23 shows results for this item from the past several PACE administrations, broken out by the different employee groups. Note the sharp increase for all groups between 2010 and 2013, with faculty overtaking administration as the group with the highest ratings on this item. This is attributable to increased professional development activities in the CTL for faculty during this period of time.

**FIGURE 3.23**
PACE RESULTS ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The CTL collects feedback from faculty upon completion of its workshops. Figure 3.25 displays the results of this feedback from the 2013-2014 year contained the following data:

- 358 full-time faculty and 227 adjunct faculty participated in at least one CTL experience
- 146 staff and administrators participated in at least one CTL experience
- In all, faculty participated in 2,376 distinct professional experiences by participating in 152 different sessions
- 172 faculty and staff served on CTL committees, facilitated workshops, volunteered to assist in peer reviewing adjunct faculty, and other activities

In addition, each year the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) prepares an Annual Report of its activities to the Provost’s Office. The most recently available report for the 2013-14 year contained the following data:

- 358 full-time faculty and 227 adjunct faculty participated in at least one CTL experience
- 146 staff and administrators participated in at least one CTL experience
- In all, faculty participated in 2,376 distinct professional experiences by participating in 152 different sessions
- 172 faculty and staff served on CTL committees, facilitated workshops, volunteered to assist in peer reviewing adjunct faculty, and other activities

**FIGURE 3.24**
The EXTENT TO WHICH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES ARE AVAILABLE
new concepts, will be able to use knowledge to improve teaching, and with other positive aspects of their experience with the workshop. As a result of the Service Learning efforts overseen by the CTL, more students are experiencing the academic enrichment that comes from applying their classroom learning to real-world problems. **Figure 3.26** displays the number of students participating in Service Learning across the past three years.

Figure 3.27 demonstrates that in addition to increases in the number of students involved in Service Learning in recent years, the number of faculty and external agencies participating has grown substantially as well.
Based on 3R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

In the PACE survey results, Sinclair employees expressed strong agreement that professional development activities are readily available to them, and this was particularly true of faculty results. The increase in agreement levels from faculty is likely due to the establishment of the CTL and the increase in the number of professional development activities it has offered in recent years. It is truly an exemplary model of the way an institution can foster professional development among its faculty.

The CTL is currently managing an important transition – its first director is returning to teaching full-time at Sinclair. It has always been planned for the directorship to be a temporary appointment made from among the faculty at Sinclair. Sinclair is currently in a transition year where the director’s successor has been moved from a faculty position into the position of Assistant Director of the CTL to allow for training. The institution has made this investment in a transition year with the view of continuing the high level of quality in professional development opportunities that the initial director of the CTL was able to establish. While faculty are the most common beneficiaries of the CTL, staff also participate in many of the professional development activities, making its continued high quality doubly important.

Improvement efforts in the area of faculty professional development in the next year will focus on making the transition as seamless as possible, and ensuring that the high standards of quality achieved will be maintained with the coming of a new director.
**AQIP CATEGORY FOUR: PLANNING AND LEADING**

**CATEGORY INTRODUCTION**

Sinclair’s Board of Trustees develop and maintain the institution’s mission, vision and values, and in collaboration with the President, establishes the College's priorities. To support the directions dictated by the mission, vision, and values, the Board of Trustees and the President developed Sinclair Core Strategies: Quality and Innovation, Accessibility, Sustainability, and Community Alignment. Within Sinclair, all leaders continually reinforce the Core Strategies in their communications through various means. College leaders have translated these high-level Core Strategies into specific strategic priorities. Sinclair has structured its budget and planning cycle to ensure resource allocation supports these strategic priorities while ensuring projects directly related to the priorities receive the requisite funding.

The college engaged both internal and external stakeholders in the development and implementation of the strategic priorities. While these priorities often emerge as a result of the work that is done with the Board of Trustees and the President, they are examined by various stakeholder groups. Besides President’s Cabinet (described in detail in section 6P1), college leaders discuss the activities that support the strategic priorities in Leadership Council, Provost’s Council, Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Department Chairs’ Council, and other stakeholder groups across campus. Monthly Town Hall meetings, run by the President, provide opportunities for other campus employees to receive communication about - and provide feedback on - strategic priorities. Presidential addresses at Fall Conference and the annual State of the College provide additional opportunities for communication and feedback. In addition, Sinclair frequently asks community leaders, members of external organizations, and consultants to provide feedback on college priorities.

One excellent example of collaboration across all levels of the college to methodically and strategically address an emerging concern is the Board of Trustee’s recent “Resolution Affirming Sinclair College Values and Principles in the Age of Performance-Based Funding.” Both administration and faculty had become increasingly concerned that Ohio’s Performance-Based Funding mandate would reduce academic standards and rigor in coursework in a quest to artificially increase student success and the amount of revenue that Sinclair receives from the state. College leaders discussed this emerging threat at various levels, and a number of these leaders voiced concerns. This resulted in a Board of Trustees resolution restating Sinclair’s commitment to the high academic standards and rigor despite perceived pressures that might move some institutions to relax them. The leadership and intra-institutional collaboration demonstrated by this example is indicative of Sinclair’s approach to planning and leading.

Opportunities to develop leadership abilities abound at Sinclair across all levels of the institution. Leadership Dayton, The Black Leadership Development Program, the Chair Academy, The League for Innovation in the Community College’s Excellence Awards, and funding for employees to pursue additional degrees all provide avenues for tapping into leadership potential of college employees. More opportunities than ever exist for employees to step into roles that allow them to develop their leadership abilities and expand their ability to influence the direction of the institution, in part due to the various completion initiatives underway.

The College's handbooks for employee groups feature legal and ethical behavioral expectations to provide clear and unambiguous direction to employees. The handbooks clearly spell out the policies on Equal Opportunity, harassment, conflict of interest, nepotism, and other ethical issues; Sinclair's employee performance review processes help ensure enforcement of these policies. The policies in these handbooks that touch legal and ethical considerations guide all decisions when issues in these areas arise.

Sinclair's website is the primary purveyor of information accessible to the public. The College makes its mission and vision statements easily accessible through www.sinclair.edu. External stakeholders can readily find information regarding academic programs, requirements, faculty and staff, accreditation, and other key areas via the website. Although available in print, the academic catalog is easily accessible online for those requiring information on college educational offerings, academic programs, and institutional policies.

**STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF PROCESSES FOR CATEGORY 4: INTEGRATED**

**STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF RESULTS FOR CATEGORY 4: INTEGRATED**

**CATEGORY RESPONSES MISSION AND VISION 4P1**

Mission and Vision focuses on how the institution develops, communicates, and reviews its mission and vision. Describe the processes for developing, communicating, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision, and values and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:
Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision, and values (1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3)

Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values

Sinclair’s Board of Trustees holds the responsibility for defining – and revising as appropriate – the institution’s mission, vision, and values, although it does so with substantial input from both internal and external constituencies, and in close collaboration with the President and President’s Cabinet. The Board of Trustees approved the current vision statement in 1994 and the current mission statement in 1997, taking into consideration the role of Ohio’s community colleges as defined by the Ohio Revised Code (addresses Core component 1.A.1).

Working in concert with the President and President’s Cabinet, the Board of Trustees sets the direction for the college in keeping with the vision, mission, and performance priorities of the institution. These leaders drafted the original set of strategic priorities that became college focal points guiding all activities and initiatives. The College revisits the priorities as the College environment changes. From time to time the Board of Trustees reviews the mission statement and vision statement, carefully considering the strategic direction the institution needs to take and whether new values and priorities are necessary to move the institution forward in meeting the higher education needs of the region. Alignment between the mission and vision statements and the current strategic priorities of the institution are considered to be of the utmost importance. The Board of Trustees sets values and priorities for the college in January 2009 following a series of discussions with college leadership groups and community leaders.

Sinclair’s current Core Strategies emerged from that work; see Figure 4.1. At Leadership Council meetings (with directors and deans) and at all Town Hall meetings, the President leads each meeting with a review of these Core Strategies, ensuring that they are kept foremost in the minds of college employees. Typically these meetings include two other reminders at the outset: a reminder of our roots with a reference to founder David Sinclair and his initial work to “find the need and endeavor to meet it” in educating those in need in the Miami Valley, and with a picture of all graduates at the most recent Commencement ceremony to remind us of our direction. This helps frame the history behind the Core Strategies, and the future they are designed to move us toward.

College leadership developed the following definitions for each component of this “foursquare” statement of the Sinclair Core Strategies. These student-centric definitions underscore that Sinclair places its educational responsibilities to students first and foremost above all other priorities (addresses Core component 1.D.2):

Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support: Students deserve the finest the college can offer in terms of instruction, facilities and services. Successful students ensure the success of the entire community.

Effective and Sustainable Organization: The extent to which Sinclair maintains a viable organization determines the quality it is able to offer students and the community. Sinclair intends to be in operation for at least another 120 years and will do what it takes to ensure its ability to grow and thrive into the future.

Access and Affordability: Sinclair has an “open door” ethic enabling those who have a desire for post-secondary education to pursue a college education and continuing education and training.

Community Alignment: Sinclair still heeds the credo of David Sinclair, who said, “Find the need and endeavor to meet it.” It develops programs that educate students for the jobs of today and tomorrow and seeks to assist the community in other endeavors that ensure quality of life and future success.

The Core Strategies listed in Figure 4.1 guided the Board of Trustees in developing strategic priorities in January 2009 with the expectation that the college would carry them out. (addresses Core components 1.D.2 and 1.D.3)

Since then, new strategic priorities have been developed annually and shared in the President’s State of the College Address.

Communicating the mission, vision, and values (1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3)

The mission statement and vision statement are available on the Sinclair website at www.sinclair.edu/about/mission/index.cfm. Strategic priorities listed in the previous section are available to the public on the President website at www.sinclair.edu/about/president/pub/strategic-priorities.pdf (addresses Core component 1.B.1). These two sources provide explication of the mission and vision statements, in addition to the strategic priorities that support them. The strategic priorities document the extent of the institution’s emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, highlighting the institution’s commitment to improving student success, expanding external partnerships, increased dialog with external stakeholders, and other priorities that the institution is pursuing to fulfill its mission. Strategic priorities clearly identify the nature, scope and intended constituents of these efforts (addresses Core components 1.B.2 and 1.B.3).

Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution’s mission (1.A.2)
As noted in sections 1P2 and 1P4, the chairperson, the dean, the Curriculum Review Committee, and Provost’s Council provide several levels of screening to assess whether proposals for new academic programs support the institution’s mission. Each academic department undergoes program review every five years, as described in section 1P4; this provides another regular opportunity to systematically assess whether programmatic offerings fit Sinclair’s mission (addresses Core component 1.A.2). In 2006-2007 the college undertook an extensive Program Alignment study. Through examination of every functional unit at the College, a cross-functional team determined the extent to which departments functioned efficiently and in accordance with Sinclair’s mission. Each unit on campus received data on cost, effectiveness, and productivity, which were then used to prepare self-study reports for review by the Program Alignment Committee. The cross-functional Committee evaluated each unit’s reports and made recommendations to President’s Cabinet for each unit. This process provided a further means of ensuring that academic programs and services continue to be relevant and consistent with Sinclair’s mission.

- Allocating resources to advance the institution’s mission and vision, while upholding the institution’s values (1.D.1, 1.A.3)

Through the college-wide budget and planning cycle, leadership analyzes all new and existing funding requests for alignment with the strategic priorities and with consideration given to anticipated enrollment, state funding, levy income, student fees, and expenditures. Sinclair is keenly aware that it is funded by taxpayer money and makes every attempt to demonstrate good stewardship in use of the funds provided by the public (addresses Core component 1.D.1). Sinclair’s leadership, in conjunction with the Budget and Analysis Office and pending approval of Board of Trustees, determines operating guidelines that influence fiscal policy, institutional efficiencies, and tuition levels for each fiscal year.

Participation in the budgeting process also serves to reinforce expectations to the internal community. As part of the annual budget process, budget managers submit capital and construction requests for review and approval. Through an online request process, departments and/or divisions indicate the extent to which their submissions align with the College’s priorities, including potential impact to students, energy efficiency, and program viability. Although departments make specific requests, institutional leadership frames the process so that individual contributors and departments operate within comparable parameters (addresses Core component 1.A.3).

Leadership scrutinizes these requests, and if approved they progress through the process for ultimate review by the appropriate vice president. The College prioritizes capital and construction requests with higher priority projects receiving approval to be included in the budget for the next fiscal year.

**4R1** What are the results for developing, communicating, and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision, and values?

- Outcomes/Measures tracked and tools utilized (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies, and employee satisfaction surveys)
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Section 3R1 contained data from the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE), which is administered at Sinclair every three years, most recently in 2013. In addition to the results shared in that section, three items relate to the College’s mission. One of these items asks respondents to rate “the extent to which the actions of this institution reflect its mission.” Figure 4.2 displays these results, which achieved a remarkable degree of convergence for administrative, faculty, professional, and support respondents in 2013 relative to previous years. In the 2013 administration each of these groups provided ratings averaging 4.1, with the exception of administration, whose ratings averaged 4.3. The 2013 results reveal a considerable amount of agreement that the institution’s actions reflect its mission, placing Sinclair squarely in the “collaborative” range on this item.

Another item on PACE asks respondents to rate “the extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution’s mission.” Figure 4.3 displays the results for this item by respondent group. In every PACE administration at Sinclair, this has always been the item with the highest agreement ratings. As was the case for the previous item, exceptionally high ratings easily place the College in the “collaborative” range.

Finally, PACE also asks employees to rate “the extent to which institution-wide policies guide my work.” While these ratings are not as high as the previous two items, it should be noted that across all employee groups the ratings increased substantially between 2010 and 2013, indicating institution-wide improvement in this area. Figure 4.4 provides evidence that institutional policies – aligned with the institutional mission by design – have an impact on the actual work of Sinclair employees.

Figure 4.5 displays the norm group comparisons for each of these three items from the 2013 administration of PACE. For each of these items, the mean ratings for Sinclair employees exceeded the Norm Base comparison mean. It should be noted that in each case the differences were statistically significant at the p = .05 level according to T-tests of significance.
Additional data providing evidence that Sinclair’s actions align with its mission and vision come from the Community Leader Survey. **Figure 4.6** displays results from the 2014 Community Leaders Survey. On a five-point scale, the leaders who participated in the survey rated Sinclair above 4.0 (on average) in quality, responsiveness to community needs, stewardship of public money, educational value, and the overall rating. The only rating whose average fell below 4.0 was quantity, which indicates the community is pleased with what Sinclair wants to offer – and wants more of it.

In this same survey:

- 90% of respondents expressed agreement that the community is better with Sinclair than without it
- 88% agreed that Sinclair offers a high quality education at an affordable price
- 76% rated Sinclair’s overall quality of education as good or excellent
Based on 4R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Although the College does not anticipate extensive revision of mission, vision statements, and the Sinclair core strategies, areas of annual focus direct employees to the most important aspects and activities of the immediate future. As part of the annual Fall Conference proceedings, the President’s presentation focuses everyone on these priorities. The priority initiatives provide a roadmap for progress on the core strategies, and include the following for the 2015–2016 year:

1. Student Success Services: Next phases to move to increased success rates.
2. Increase WPAFB-oriented relationships and capitalize on related shared assets.
3. Develop completion incentives for students.
4. Complete the development of several bachelor’s degree programs.
5. Increase dialog meetings with key stakeholders to better meet their needs.
6. Preserve sustainability and mitigate adverse side effects.

The Program Review and Annual Update processes help ensure that academic programs and services continue to align with the institution’s mission and priorities, and this will continue to be the case in the future.

**STRATEGIC PLANNING**

Strategic Planning focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing, and reviewing the institution’s plans and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- **Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning (5.C.3)**

The strategic priorities for the institution form the overarching goals for the College, and the key planning processes of the College support these priorities. Planning at the highest level emerges initially from the President and his executive team, in consultation with the Board of Trustees, and external constituencies. However, these initial plans evolve with input among stakeholder groups at the college, and major decisions involve input from the entire organization. Sinclair benefits greatly from senior leaders who embrace a collaborative leadership model. For example, the President, Board of Trustees, and Cabinet developed the core strategies (4P1) with input from internal stakeholder groups. Once senior leadership have developed proposals in weekly President’s Cabinet meetings, other leaders of the college have an opportunity to weigh in. Leadership Council serves as an important sounding board and discussion forum for issues related to strategic planning, and is comprised of all dean- and director-level and above positions at Sinclair, in addition to representatives from

Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Department Chairperson’s Council, and Student Leadership. As the College develops or revises elements of strategic planning, Leadership Council provides an opportunity for representatives of all internal stakeholder groups to be included in the discussion.

After feedback has been obtained from lower-level administration via Leadership Council, the President seeks additional feedback on proposed priorities in one of the monthly Town Hall meetings held periodically throughout the year. These events, which all employees are invited to attend, provide an opportunity to collect additional feedback from more constituents. They also provide an excellent mechanism for communicating new priorities across the college, and for conversation, dialog, and problem solving with the campus community. Attendance at Town Hall meetings is strongly encouraged for all college employees (addresses Core component 5.C.3).

During the annual Fall Conference, the President addresses all faculty, staff, and administrators to discuss the year ahead in relationship to the College's strategic priorities. This college-wide event aids group understanding of core priorities. Following Fall Conference the real work of accomplishing these plans occurs at the operational level. In addition, each Spring term the President presents a State of the College address for community leaders and Sinclair employees. These large-scale events are supplemented and amplified at the more frequent, internally focused Town Hall meetings. The President’s presentations at Fall Conference and the State of the College serve as an excellent mechanism for disseminating information on the current direction of the college and any recent changes to priorities.

The College involves external stakeholders in discussion of new directions and priorities. Senior leaders maintain strong connections in the community and develop networks of community leaders who can be called upon to provide guidance and feedback. The Advancement Division and the President work together to maintain active, working relationships with over 100 organizations external to Sinclair, all of which have influence and resources needed by the college. Additionally, on many occasions senior leadership utilizes external consultants to help shape strategic plans in ways that align with emerging trends and needs of the region (addresses Core component 5.C.3).

- **Aligning operations with the institution’s mission, vision, values (5.C.2)**

The strategic priorities that the institution develops – which are carefully aligned with the mission and vision statements – guide resource allocation. Yearly budget processes provide an opportunity to review all budget units to ensure that their operations contribute to strategic priorities, and thus align with Sinclair’s mission, vision, and values. This has been particularly
true in the last budget cycle and the one currently underway. As state funding has declined along with revenue from the levy, Sinclair has taken an especially close look at units to determine where costs savings could be realized. The strategic priorities – and by extension the mission and vision statements – guide decisions regarding which operations should be prioritized, and which may need careful review to determine their relevance and ability to meet the needs of internal and/or external stakeholders. Recently Sinclair established a committee composed of four senior level administrators who carefully review vacant positions to determine whether the College should fill or reallocate the positions based on the extent to which they support current strategic priorities. Based on the work of this committee, positions have been eliminated if they did not support these priorities (addresses Core component 5.C.2). While Sinclair has always worked to align operations with the institution’s mission, vision, and values, decreasing state support and declining levy revenues have forced the institution to examine budget units with an even greater level of scrutiny.

• **Aligning efforts across departments, divisions, and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency (5.B.3)**

As was the case for ensuring alignment of operations with the institution’s mission, vision, and values, decreased revenues have moved Sinclair to examine budget units for effectiveness and efficiency even more than has traditionally been the case. Sinclair has always prided itself on being a responsible steward of taxpayer dollars, and has historically striven to spend public funds as prudently as possible. With the drop in incoming tax dollars, effectiveness and efficiency have become an even greater priority. In the budget planning process for FY 2015-16, vice presidents seek to increase efficiency by decreasing budgets for the coming fiscal year. Each vice president works with his/her respective departments to identify previously unrealized opportunities for cost savings, thereby increasing effectiveness and efficiency. The vice presidents, empowered to revise policy and processes in their areas where appropriate to accomplish this goal, work collaboratively with the deans/directors of the departments in their divisions. It has been made clear that these effort should not be solely top-down, but should involve collaborative work between vice presidents and deans/directors – and furthermore those who report to them – in identifying cost reductions (addresses Core component 3.B.3).

One major part of this effort is the identification of duplication of efforts: the College acknowledges overlap in some student-facing services, and leadership has identified and addressed these areas, merging services where appropriate to streamline efforts without reducing the ability to meet student needs. This work is ongoing, and it is anticipated that in the next Systems Portfolio Sinclair will be able to present examples of merged services and reduction of duplicative work with subsequent increases in efficiency.

• **Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and counteracting the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats (5.C.4, 5.C.5)**

• **Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs (5.C.1, 5.C.4)**

No more telling or compelling example highlights Sinclair’s efforts to capitalize on strengths to counter potential threats than the advent of Performance Based Funding. Sinclair has always placed a high priority on increasing student success, as evidenced by the many initiatives dedicated to this in the past. Section 2R2 provides evidence that these initiatives designed to increase student success have had an impact, and that comparisons of three distinct longitudinal cohort groups from the past decade have shown significant increases in several measures of student success. However, even with these past initiatives Sinclair finds itself at a funding disadvantage relative to other institutions with Ohio’s new higher education funding formula that is based solely on student success measures (see Figure 2.10, Figure 2.11, and the discussion at the beginning of section 2R2 for additional detail). Ohio apportions a set overall funding amount for community colleges in its budget – the amount of an individual community college’s overall apportionment depends on its success measures relative to the other community colleges. An increase in performance by one community college cannot result in increased funding for that college unless it exceeds the increase in performance by other community colleges. By way of analogy, there is only so much pie; a bigger piece can’t be given to one community college without reducing the piece of another. Sinclair was quick to recognize the institutional impact of this fluctuation in state funding revenue (addresses Core component 5.C.4).

In this new funding environment, Sinclair finds itself competing against other community colleges favored to a much greater extent in student success by geography, demographics, and other factors beyond the control of the institutions. The challenge of reduced state revenue is one of the top “potential threats” that the College faces. However, Sinclair’s response to this challenge seeks to capitalize on some of the institution’s greatest strengths. Sinclair has always been known for its ability to quickly and nimbly deploy new initiatives – the institution is relying heavily on this strength to fast track initiatives designed to increase student completion and thereby counter the impact of the new funding formula. Rather than dwelling on its demographic and geographic disadvantages relative to student success in comparison with other Ohio community colleges, Sinclair is seeking to harness its ability to develop and implement new ideas to increase success and gain back some of the state revenue losses. Grant-funded completion initiatives, coordinated.
by the Associate Provost for Student Success, supply the frontline strategy for accomplishing this. With process revisions and new technology applications, the College strategically supports these efforts to increase student success (see 1P5). These emerging factors form the main thrust of the institution's planning to counter this potential loss in funding by capitalizing on some of Sinclair's strengths (addresses Core component 5.C.5), and represent some of the institution's highest priorities in terms of resource allocation in alignment with its mission and priorities (addresses Core component 5.C.1).

What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing, and reviewing the institution's operational plans?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Sinclair's institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) reflect the best measures of how well the institution's operational plans have been communicated, planned, and implemented. KPIs, a set of measures analyzed annually, supply an institutional evaluation of how well the college is progressing in its priority areas. Each KPI addresses a component of Sinclair's strategies: Quality & Innovation, Sustainable, Community Aligned, and Accessible. Figure 4.1 in section 4P1 shows these strategies that guide Sinclair's institutional operations.

Figure 4.7 provides results from the KPIs for 2013-14 for Quality & Innovation, and links each KPI to the strategic priority that it supports. Several of the KPIs report results for both the IPEDS cohort of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students, and the more inclusive Completion by Design (CbD) cohort.

Examining the results for the Quality & Innovation in Figure 4.7, it can be seen that, for Student Credential Attainment, the IPEDS cohort of students (only around 8.5% of students are included in the IPEDS cohort for a given year) lagged in terms of degree completion rates, while the more inclusive CbD cohort's rate was almost a full percentage point higher than the 2014 target (over 22% of students are included in the CbD cohort for a given year). Certificate attainment rates in both groups showed significantly higher results than the established 2014 targets.

For Student Transfer the overall student transfer rates showed above target results. CbD cohort certificate earners transferred at double the target rate, while CbD degree earners lagged. In the area of Developmental Student Success, Sinclair saw strong improvement in overall developmental student success in the State Success metric (number of students completing their first developmental course within the year).

The percentage of students moving from DEV Math to College level Math within one year came in slightly above target. The number of students moving from DEV to College level English within a year fell short of target.

Sinclair's Course Completion rate results, a new KPI metric in FY 2013-14, show below target (75%), although the completion rate is on par with that of Ohio peer institutions (73%). The college has dramatically sharpened its focus on course completion rates (as well as other PBF metrics) and substantial work is underway to define
strategies to improve them. For all measures illustrated in Figure 4.7, the KPI rating came in at “good,” “very good,” or “excellent” for FY 2013-14. Four KPIs support “Sustainable”. Figure 4.8 displays results for these KPIs for FY 2013-14.

One important measure in the KPIs is the Annual Net Operating Budget Margin, which indicates efficiency in expenditure alignment with budget allocation. The 3 – 4% FY 2013-14 target resulted in an actual 3.4% Net Operating Budget Margin for FY 2013-14.

Another KPI related to the institution’s operational plans targets financial audits as required by the state: Senate Bill 6 of the Ohio 122nd General Assembly, which is designed to “increase financial accountability of state colleges and universities by using a standard set of measures with which to monitor the fiscal health of its campuses,” (see www.ohiohighered.org/campus-accountability). The State uses ratio scores from 0 (lowest degree of fiscal strength) to 5 (highest degree of fiscal strength) as institutional fiscal health indicators. Sinclair’s KPIs set a FY 2013-14 target ratio score of 4 - 4.5. Sinclair achieved a 4.2 Senate Bill 6 ratio, indicating strong fiscal health well within the KPI target. Sinclair continues to experience successful Financial Audit and Senate Bill 6 scores, highlighting its sound financial management practices and affordability.

The 2013 PACE Campus Climate survey administration to all employees showed outstanding results across the board. The Employee Engagement score, based on a subset of the PACE questions, showed significantly above target.

Finally, one KPI addresses regulatory approvals and accreditations, with no issues in these areas. As was the case for “Quality & Innovation,” for “Sustainable,” the FY 2013-14 KPI ratings came in at “good,” “very good,” or “excellent”.

Figure 4.9 displays the results for the three KPIs that support “Community Aligned”.

The College measures Community Alignment via surveys of three key stakeholder groups: community leaders via the Community Leader Survey, the general public via a survey, and employers of recent graduates via RAR’s Employer Survey. In each case, results exceeded the FY 2013-14 Target, showing “good” or “very good” results indicative that community alignment with leaders, the general public, and employers is strong.

Finally, “Accessible”, is supported by four KPIs, as can be seen in Figure 4.10.
Sinclair’s penetration rates (15-49 year olds) improved slightly in Warren and Clinton counties, remained steady in Preble, Hamilton, Darke, and Butler counties, and declined slightly in Montgomery, Miami, Green, Clermont and Clark counties. Sinclair’s competition experienced their most improved penetration rates in Greene and Montgomery counties. This is further continuation of a trend first identified in the 2012 Market Analysis. The College has Strategic Enrollment Management efforts underway to reverse this phenomenon.

Diversity of Students KPI results indicated that the proportion of minorities attending Sinclair is greater than the proportion of minorities attending other regional institutions and our student diversity rate has remained relatively consistent over time. However, our peer institutions have continued to increase their minority student enrollment, and Sinclair may need to increase efforts to continue enrolling a higher proportion of students from this key stakeholder group.

The Enrollment KPI showed that enrollment increased 4.8% compared to the previous year, although it fell short of the targeted enrollment by 1.8%. The Summer 2013 term enrollment substantially exceeded the previous year summer term and the specified target, but the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 terms’ enrollment lagged.

Sinclair continues to see a decrease in the penetration rate of direct and delayed entry high school students from our top feeder schools, which impacts the High Schools KPI. Competition for these students has ramped up intensely. The College added two new metrics reflecting the engagement of current high school students in college courses. These populations, strategic and mission critical, effectively jumpstart regional educational attainment with high achieving student participation. In anticipation of Dual Enrollment’s inclusion in the state PBF model (Ohio deferred this metric this year), the College is building baseline targets for the future although none existed in FY 2013-2014. High school enrollment grew exponentially over the past year. PSEO enrollment went from 495 to 548 students (+9.7%) and Dual Enrollment from 112 to 558 (+398%). It should be noted that the nomenclature of these two KPIs will change with the new College Credit Plus initiative that the state has introduced, which subsumes these prior initiatives. Overall, Sinclair has experienced excellent growth in the number of high school students taking Sinclair courses, as can be seen in Figure 4.11, although substantial opportunity remains.

Based on 4R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

As has been noted in various previous sections of the Systems Portfolio (see section 2P2), Performance Based Funding has been a game changer for Ohio higher education. Much of the strategic planning in the next three years will be geared toward improving the metrics associated with Performance Based Funding. To a large extent, this will involve the completion initiatives described in detail in section 1P5.

Related to the 4R2 data, some of the biggest challenges will involve improving student credential attainment, another institutional priority addressed through a number of current major initiatives. The KPIs related to sustainability indicate there is presently not a cause for great concern, although with the change in state funding Sinclair has taken steps to reduce...
costs and improve efficiency, and those efforts will be ongoing in the coming years.

Regarding the KPI for High Schools, Ohio redesigned its approach to providing college level coursework to students who are still enrolled in high school. Various state programs such as dual enrollment, Post Secondary Enrollment Options, and others are being consolidated under a new program called “College Credit Plus,” recently authorized in Ohio Revised Code 3365 and effective September 15, 2014 (see www.ohiohighered.org/college_credit_plus for additional details). Sinclair will be adapting its high school initiatives over the next several years to strengthen college-wide alignment with this new law (see www.sinclair.edu/precollege/ccp/).

LEADERSHIP

Leadership focuses on governance and leadership of the institution. Describe the processes for ensuring sound and effective leadership of the institution and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Establishing appropriate board-institutional relationships to support leadership and governance (2.C.4)
- Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board (2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)
- Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators, and academic matters to faculty (2.C.4)

Per Ohio Revised Code Section 3354.09, Sinclair’s Board of Trustees has the power and authority to make final decisions about matters of educational policy, financial management, personnel appointments, and physical facilities development. Section 3354.09 defines the board-institutional relationship, and enumerates the powers and responsibilities that the Board has toward the institution (see codes.ohio.gov/orc/3354.09 for more detail regarding this relationship). Thus the Board is required by state law to oversee the institution’s financial and academic policies and practices, as well as to execute legal and fiduciary responsibilities related to the institution (addresses Core component 5.B.1). Sinclair’s President reports directly to the Board of Trustees, and the President and Vice Presidents who compose the President’s Cabinet actively participate in regular Board of Trustees meetings every other month, as do the deans of each academic division, the President of Faculty Senate, the President of Staff Senate, and the President of Department Chairperson’s Council (addresses Core component 5.B.2).

The eleven Board of Trustees members, appointed authorities as follows:

- Six trustees are appointed by the Montgomery County Commissioners
- One trustee is appointed by the Warren County Commissioners
- Four trustees are appointed by the Governor

Appointment by county commissioners and the governor of Ohio helps insulate the Board from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, and other external groups in that a mix of local and state appointees is maintained (addresses Core component 2.C.3). Traditionally Board membership reflects a cross-section of the constituencies in the Greater Dayton region.

The Board has three subcommittees: Personnel and Curriculum, Strategic Linkages, and Finance and Investment. The subcommittees generally meet one week before the regular meetings of the entire Board of Trustees. The following URL houses Board of Trustees meeting information, membership of the Board of Trustees, and all Board Resolutions from 1990 to the present: www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/board/.

However, the Board generally provides high-level guidance of college activities and is concerned more with the overall direction of the college than its day-to-day operations. It is true that major policy changes may require Board approval, but the Board considers those policy changes in the context of the campus as a whole and not in terms of specific processes and practices. Sinclair’s President, Vice Presidents, and other administrative personnel conduct day-to-day operations of the institution without direct supervision by the Board of Trustees so long as those operations align with the direction that the Board has set for the institution and fall within the parameters that have been set by the Board’s various resolutions.

The planning that directs Sinclair’s operations for the year has its genesis with the Board, but college personnel carry out the implementation of that planning. Each January, the Board of Trustees, Foundation Board and President’s Cabinet conduct a Board Advance, a day-long, intensive workshop where they discuss and determine key institutional strategies. The Board Advance commences with a review of the opportunities and vulnerabilities identified through institutional performance data, internal and external stakeholder feedback and environmental scanning. The Board reviews major issues for the College's growth and development in light of the core strategic priorities. The Board revisits these strategies throughout the year at the regular Board of Trustees meetings to ensure alignment.

After the Board formulates strategies within the three different subcommittees (Personnel and Curriculum, Finance and Investment, and Strategic Linkages), the President’s Cabinet reviews the strategies and engages the broader campus community to address the issues through the annual operational plans. Various vice presidents on President’s Cabinet spearhead implementation of the high-level strategies developed by the Board. Working with the President, members of the President’s Cabinet exercise their own judgment and initiative in implementing these strategies in their areas of responsibility (addresses Core component 2.C.4).
• Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions, and departments

Sinclair maintains a number of different lines of communication to ensure that various units within the college remain interconnected and aware of each other’s activities. The President initiates some of these lines of communication that reach across the breadth of the institution. Examples of this include:

• The President’s State of the College address, delivered each April
• The President’s update each August to all employees at Fall Conference
• Various Town Hall meetings the President schedules with the campus community monthly throughout the year and which all employees are encouraged to attend
• Weekly President’s Cabinet meetings involving information-sharing with Vice Presidents with the expectation that they will share information as appropriate with the divisions that they lead

Other lines of communication include:

• The electronic Sinclair Buzz newsletter which is disseminated regularly to all Sinclair employees via e-mail and College’s portal
• Monthly Instructional Council meetings, presided over by the Provost, which include representatives from various areas across the college
• Weekly Provost Council meetings
• Weekly Leadership Team meetings within each academic division
• Monthly Department Chairs Council meetings
• Regular meetings of administrators and staff within Student Services and Instructional Technology
• Regular electronic newsletters from the Courseview Campus and the Learning Centers
• Meetings of the Faculty Issues Team (FIT)
• Coffee with the Provost (monthly informal meetings between the Provost and faculty)

In short, multiple avenues exist for the wide dissemination of information across the institution.

• Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards (5.B.3)

Recent events at Sinclair provide an excellent example of ensuring maintenance of high academic standards through collaboration across the institution. With the advent of a state funding formula based on Performance Based Funding, Sinclair faculty became increasingly concerned that funding considerations would lead to pressure on faculty to relax grading criteria, thus artificially inflating students’ grades in an attempt to increase the College’s share of funding from the state. The faculty shared their concerns with their supervisors, and the communication continued through to the President, who shared these concerns with the Board of Trustees. Faculty Senate also widely discussed these concerns.

In response to these concerns, in January 2014 the Board of Regents issued the resolution displayed in Figure 4.12. This resolution can be accessed online at www.sinclair.edu/about/administrative/board/resolutions/2010-2014/2014/index.cfm.

**FIGURE 4.12 RESOLUTION AFFIRMING SINCLAIR COLLEGE VALUES AND PRINCIPLES**

The resolution, an end product of a substantial amount of discussion at various levels across the institution, provides compelling evidence of the strong commitment to high academic standards among Sinclair faculty and administrators. While increasing student success remains a top priority, there is a strong resolve that student success statistics will not be improved at the expense of academic rigor and integrity. (addresses Core component 5.B.3).

• Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders (2.C.1, 2.C.2)

Sinclair provides effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders in three ways that incorporate the various viewpoints of these stakeholders. First, for decades the members of the Sinclair Board of Trustees, the President, and Vice Presidents have been very active at the regional, state, and national levels in engaging with government officials and industry and community leaders. This input from external sources is absolutely crucial to Sinclair’s ability to consider the needs and interests of external stakeholders in institutional decision-making (addresses Core component 2.C.2). As has been mentioned in several previous sections, the 2009 Board-approved Core Strategies (Quality and Innovation, Sustainable, Accessible, Community Aligned) have been reviewed at the opening of most major campus meetings since their inception. A strong effort is made to keep these strategic priorities foremost in the minds of all college employees, and they guide decision-making by both the Board of Trustees and college administration (addresses Core component 2.C.1). As was mentioned in 4R2, the College.
ensures communication of the Strategic Priorities
to guide decision-making and continually
measure and monitor results.
Second, Sinclair’s organizational structure has
embedded within it several departments that
provide information about and/or maintain
strong ties to internal and external institutional
stakeholders:
• Research, Analytics and Reporting: Among its
chiet accountability is ensuring data availability
through the DAWN Portal to guide decisions
across the College, including: (A) Student and
course information, (B) HR data, (C) Financial
data, (D) Survey data. Upon request, this
information is analyzed and presented to the
Board of Trustees, President’s Cabinet, and
Leadership Council to help inform strategy and
decision-making.
• Workforce Development and Corporate
Services Division: This division, established
in the fall of 2006, provides training and
development services to employers, noncredit
continuing education to multiple audiences,
and leadership to economic initiatives of the
community.
• Office of Grants Development: With declining
higher education funding, this department’s role
is more critical than ever. Grants Development
personnel seek out and write grants that award
funding for specific College initiatives and assist
other departments to determine program or
service funding eligibility.
• Advancement Division: This division,
established in 2007, is responsible for media
relations, government relations, private donor
fundraising, and grants management. In
addition, this office develops and maintains
hundreds of Sinclair partnerships to acquire
support for student success, as well as to
advocate for the college in the public policy
arena.
• School and Community Partnerships: The
programs within this department are designed
to help middle and high school age students
prepare for college and earn college credit
while still in high school. Sinclair’s pre-college
programs strengthen partnerships with area
schools and agencies by providing supplemental
education and programs, offer a variety of pre-
college educational opportunities, encourage
students’ personal growth and development and
provide social, cultural and academic readiness
activities.
Third, Sinclair utilizes a variety of advisory
committees in Instruction. These committees,
comprised of industry experts representing
various occupations, come together to discuss the
future direction of academic programs and other
Sinclair initiatives. The College employs these
advisory committees as part of the institution’s
efforts to “consider the reasonable and relevant
interests of external constituencies” (addresses
Core component 2.C.2).

• Developing leaders at all levels within
the institution
The opportunity to develop and nurture
leadership skills is available to employees at
all levels within Sinclair. Through informal
opportunities supervisors frequently seek to
develop leadership skills in their employees by
nominating them to serve on the various cross-
functional committees across campus and by
providing them other opportunities as they
become available. More formalized processes
also supply leadership growth and development
opportunities for faculty and staff, including
• John and Suanne Roueche Teaching
Excellence. Each year, Sinclair selects
several faculty for the Excellence in Teaching
Award recognition, previously named the
National Institute for Staff and Organizational
Development (NISOD). A tradition since
1989, the NISOD Excellence Awards program
was established to further support individual
colleges recognizing and celebrating their
finest faculty at home and on an international
stage. More recently, the NISOD award has
been replaced by the John and Suanne
Roueche award.
• Leadership Dayton. Leadership Dayton is
sponsored by the Dayton Area Chamber of
Commerce, is designed to build upon the
dedication and leadership abilities of the
participants. In a rigorous 10-month period,
class members learn about every major
aspect of community life from education and
economic development to criminal justice
and cultural arts. Annually, Sinclair selects
participants on the basis of their leadership
potential and demonstrated commitment to
the community.
• The Black Leadership Development
Program An eight-month program facilitated
through the Dayton Urban League, the
Black Leadership Development Program is
designed to identify, educate, motivate,
and develop a select group of citizens for
leadership positions within our community.
Annually, Sinclair selects participants based
on their ability, leadership potential and
demonstrated interest in the community.
• The Chair Academy. The Academy for
Leadership and Development, also known as
the Chair Academy, offers opportunities to
acquire and understand major research
and theoretical developments in leadership.
Participants have opportunities to develop
proficiency in selecting, integrating, and
applying appropriate concepts from social
and behavioral science and adult education
in formulating and implementing approaches
to leadership problems and issues. The
Academy provides a systems approach to
transformational leadership. The program
is dedicated to long-term change. Sinclair
regularly selects department chairs to attend
the Chair Academy.
• **Funding for Degree Attainment.** New Degree Attainment is available through tuition reimbursement program. Staff or faculty members must first apply for approval to complete a program of study, indicating the benefits to the College of a specific program of study as well as the position in the College to which they aspire. Through the formal approval of the educational plans, the employee and the College commit to professional development with a future career path in mind in addition to tuition reimbursement for courses completed with a satisfactory grade.

Each of these leadership opportunities and related processes for acceptance into these activities allows Sinclair employees the opportunity to enhance their leadership skills.

• **Ensuring the institution’s ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision (2.C.3)**

Sinclair has the resources, organizational structure, and personnel necessary to act in accordance with its mission and vision. Sinclair strives to maintain close ties to the community without cultivating relationships that might compromise its mission and vision. While Sinclair seeks donor support, it does so without providing influence or access that might unduly affect institutional practice or policy. While Sinclair works closely with elected officials to learn more about regional needs and to promote understanding of issues in higher education, it does so in ways that support, rather than undermine, its mission and vision statements. From the structure of the Board of Trustees mentioned earlier in this section to the organization of its various committees and councils, safeguards are in place to avoid influences which might attempt to inappropriately affect the direction of the college. Sinclair’s efforts remains focused on its mission and vision, without distraction from other entities that might influence its priorities. In its dealings with external partners, Sinclair maintains both the closeness required for true collaboration and the distance required to maintain movement in the direction of its mission (addresses Core component 2.C.3).

What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution?

• Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
• Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
• Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
• Interpretation of results and insights gained

PACE provides feedback from employees at the college concerning leadership at the college and how well leadership communicates to the institution as a whole (3R1). One of the most relevant PACE items in this area is the question regarding “the extent to which Sinclair’s leadership communicates a clear vision for the future direction of the college,” for this item not only provides information on the vision that leadership has for the progress of Sinclair, but also gives an indication of how well that vision is being disseminated to the college as a whole. **Figure 4.13** displays remarkable improvement by the institution in this area, with each year’s mean ratings representing a statistically significant change from the previous year. More than at any time in the past decade, Sinclair employees feel that their leaders have a clear vision for the future that is being communicated appropriately to the college at large.

As an institution of higher education, Sinclair recognizes the importance of students as stakeholders. **Figure 4.14** displays responses to the PACE ratings for the item “the extent to which administrative leadership is focused on meeting the needs of students.” While not as dramatic as the improvement seen in the item for leadership communicating a clear vision, there has been a small but consistent improvement in ratings for this item since the 2004 and 2007 administrations of PACE.

**Figure 4.13**

Pace Rating of Communication of a Clear Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.14**

Pace Rating of Communication of Leadership Focus on Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focusing on communication from leadership, results indicated a statistically significant improvement between 2010 and 2013 administrations of PACE in mean ratings for the item “the extent to which information is shared within the institution,” as illustrated in **Figure 4.15**.

**Figure 4.15**

The Extent to Which Administrative Leadership Is Focused on the Meeting the Needs of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The College noted a similar statistically significant increase between 2010 and 2013 means for the PACE item “the extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution.” Results are displayed in Figure 4.16.

Two additional PACE items target the way that information is shared across the institution. Figure 4.17 displays results for the item “the extent to which information I receive is useful to my work.” As seen in the previous items, there has been an increase in recent years (in this and subsequent charts where 2004 data are not reported, the question was not included in the 2004 PACE survey).

PACE respondents also reported generally favorable ratings regarding receiving information related to their work, and those feelings have improved somewhat over the past three administrations of PACE, as shown in Figure 4.18.

Regarding the College’s work developing leaders at all levels of the institution, some indication of how well Sinclair employees feel that the institution is doing in this regard is provided by the PACE item where respondents rate “the extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution.” Figure 4.19 displays mean ratings for this item across all respondents, and provides some evidence of improvement in this area from the 2007 administration to the 2010 administration of PACE at Sinclair.

In addition to the individual items, important information regarding the leadership of the college and climate that they have established can be gleaned from the summary ratings of PACE for all employees. Figure 4.20 provides the PACE summary data in each area for all employees. Of particular note is the overall score, which is designed as an overall measure of college climate. Since 2007, there have been steady increases in the overall score based on employees’ responses to PACE.

As Figure 4.21 shows, the interpretation of these scores shows that Sinclair outperforms the PACE norm base. The PACE 2013 results reported in Figure 4.21 place Sinclair in or close to the desired Collaborative range in most areas. The PACE results provide internal evidence regarding the quality of the leadership and communication at Sinclair. External evidence supports this as well – in January 2013 Sinclair conducted a survey of local community leaders, and received the following mean ratings from respondents on a scale from 1 (very ineffective) to 5 (very effective): Quality: 4.3 Responsiveness: 4.5 Stewardship: 4.4 Value: 4.5 Overall: 4.5

Moreover, Sinclair regularly surveys residents of Montgomery County, and the quality of Sinclair’s leadership receives external validation through the consistently strong positive feelings respondents have expressed toward Sinclair, as can be seen in Figure 4.22.
employees due to the myriad of completion initiatives. Completion by Design, Connect 4 Completion, City Connects, and various other initiatives have drawn on faculty and staff to populate the various working groups that push these initiatives forward. Many employees have had opportunities to develop leadership skills, chairing workgroups and otherwise contributing in the subcommittees that have shouldered the work for these initiatives to succeed. The college has created a small number of full-time positions to lead these initiatives, and in every instance rather than hiring from outside the college, employees have been promoted from within the college to lead them. Many other faculty have received release time to lead workgroups for these initiatives, while staff members have also had opportunities to step into leadership roles within the working groups. Currently there are more opportunities for Sinclair employees to gain valuable leadership experience than there has ever been, and this should remain the case for at least several years.

INTEGRITY

4R3 Integrity focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards, monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met, and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Developing and communicating standards
- Training employees for legal and ethical behavior

Various handbooks hold the standards expected of Sinclair employees, guiding employee behavior and day-to-day decision making. When employees have questions related to expectations, they consult the appropriate handbook. The College maintains these handbooks, available to all employees, on Sinclair’s intranet include:

- The Faculty Handbook
- The Adjunct Faculty Handbook
- The Full-time Employee Handbook
- The Part-time Employee Handbook
- The Employee General Safety Handbook

Developed and overseen by different groups on campus, a description of each of these handbooks follows:

The Faculty Handbook, revised in August 2013, is the result of a collaborative effort between administrators and Faculty Senate to implement Board of Trustees policies. The Provost’s Office and Faculty Senate make changes to the Sinclair Faculty Handbook (www.sinclair.edu/about/pub/faculty_handbook.pdf), with some sections subject to approval by the Board of Trustees. According to the Faculty Handbook “the Board of Trustees acknowledges the valuable contribution of faculty to the strengths of the college and recognizes that it is desirable for representatives
of the administration and faculty to confer about policies and procedures concerning faculty employment.”

The Faculty Handbook is divided into two sections. The first, Part A: Terms and Conditions of Employment, is considered part of the faculty contract for employment. The second, Part B: Additional Policies and Procedures, is not considered part of the faculty contract, but “is to be adhered to carefully.” Part A may only be revised with approval of Sinclair’s President and Board of Trustees, while Part B “may be altered at any time by mutual agreement of the Faculty Senate and the President of the College or the President’s designee.” Additionally, it is stated that “the Faculty Senate and the office of the chief academic officer shall review the Faculty Handbook at least annually in order to keep current its policies, procedures, and general information.”

The Adjunct Faculty Handbook is overseen by the Office of Adjunct Faculty Support Services, which is housed within HR. The Adjunct Faculty Handbook familiarizes adjunct faculty with Sinclair’s vision statement and mission statement, provides information on the history of Sinclair and its current organization, and describes compensation, benefits, and personnel policies that affect adjunct faculty. It also contains a comprehensive list of college policies, including the Academic Freedom policy, the Acceptable Use of Information Technology Policy, the Harassment Policy, and the Non-Discrimination Policy. The Adjunct Faculty Handbook provides exhaustive detail on the duties and responsibilities of an adjunct faculty member, and also gives guidance on accessing college services.

The Full-time Employee Handbook, developed and maintained by Sinclair’s HR, was last revised in March 2014. The Full-time Employee Handbook provides employees with a Sinclair overview, college policies, practices, and benefits that most directly affect them and their families. Because these policies and practices are subject to change, the Handbook is periodically updated. The Handbook includes the Sinclair mission and vision statements, information on governance and decision making at Sinclair, policies and procedures, employee benefits, and college services and resources. Several sections deal directly with issues involving integrity, including sections on policies regarding nepotism, conflict of interest, and the grievance procedure.

The Part-time Employee Handbook, revised in January 2014, contains much of the same information as the Full-time Employee Handbook, including the mission and vision statements, the information on governance and decision making at Sinclair, policies and procedures, employee benefits, policies regarding nepotism, conflict of interest, and the grievance procedure. There is also an extensive section on college services and resources available to part-time employees.

The Employee General Safety Handbook provides important information regarding safety awareness and appropriate employee responses for various types of emergencies.

Training new employees for legal and ethical behavior is part of the onboarding process at Sinclair. All new employees attend a five-hour New Hire Orientation, which is conducted monthly, and at which various college processes are explained and information is provided regarding college policies, with a particular emphasis on issues surrounding integrity and ethical behavior.

- **Modeling ethical and legal behavior from the highest levels of the organization**
- **Ensuring the ethical practice of all employees (2.A.)**
- **Operating financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty, and staff (2.A.)**

The Sinclair Mission Statement (see Figure O.1) affirms a commitment to “manage our human physical and financial resources in a caring, ethical, and prudent way.” Thus a commitment to ethical behavior at all levels of the institution is explicitly built into the mission statement that guides all of the college’s initiatives and activities. To help guide employees in conducting college business in an ethical and legal manner, the following sections have been included in the Full-time Employee Handbook (similar sections have been included in the other handbooks referenced in the previous section):

- **Nepotism.** Members of the same family may be appointed to positions when it has been determined that they are the most qualified candidates for the positions. No employee shall participate in recommendations or decisions concerning pay, performance or promotion involving an individual with whom the employee has a familial relationship.

- **Conflict of Interest.** It is the policy of the College that its transactions with individuals and organizations outside the College are conducted at all times on a highly ethical and arms-length basis. To this end, the primary consideration must be in the best interests of the College. Consequently, decisions made in conducting such relationships and transactions must not be influenced by self-interest on the part of a board member, officer, or employee that may potentially or actually be in conflict with the interests of the College.

A conflict of interest exists when a person uses his or her influence, knowledge of College events, and/or power or position to bring about a direct or indirect personal benefit from any business transaction with the College other than from his or her regular compensation.

- **Grievance Procedure.** Sinclair recognizes that in any employee group, difficulties, misunderstandings, or grievances may arise. It is the earnest wish of the College that all such
problems be resolved quickly and fairly. In order to accomplish this, a procedure has been developed to provide a method of resolving disputes in an equitable and timely manner and at the lowest supervisory level possible. As such, the grievance procedure is recognized as a non-judicial administrative process.

The College makes available additional policies regarding ethical and legal behavior on the college’s intranet in the HR section. In addition to the nepotism, conflict of interest, and grievance procedure policies provided above, the HR area in the college’s intranet also contains the following college policies:

- **Equal Opportunity/ Non-Discrimination.** Sinclair Community College is strongly committed to a policy of equal opportunity in its employment practices, educational programs and activities, and the many services it offers to the community. The college does not discriminate against applicants, employees, or students on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, veteran status, national origin, ancestry, citizenship or disability.

- **Flex Time.** Sinclair Community College does not have a formal “flex” time policy that allows employees to schedule their work hours around a core period during the workday at their own discretion. Therefore, flex time is not permitted.

- **Comp Time.** Sinclair Community College does not have a formal “comp” time policy that allows support staff (non-exempt) employees to take time off for overtime worked. Therefore, “comp” time is not permitted.

- **Employee Harassment Policy & Procedure.** Sinclair Community College is strongly committed to a policy of equal opportunity in its employment practices, education programs and activities, and the many services it offers to the community. The college does not discriminate against applicants, employees, or students on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, veteran status, national origin, ancestry, citizenship or disability. Offensive or harassing behavior will not be tolerated against any person in the workplace.

- **Student Harassment Policy.** Sinclair Community College is committed to providing an educational environment free from harassment (including sexual harassment). Such conduct will not be tolerated in the academic environment and constitutes a violation of the Student Code of Conduct. Harassment on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, age, sex, marital status, veteran status, national origin, ancestry, citizenship, or disability, or any other protected status, is strictly prohibited.

Additional policies on the HR intranet website provide guidance regarding alcohol consumption, work outside the primary position, hours of work and overtime, family and medical leave, and other policy and practice matters that are less related to legal and ethical conduct than the ones listed above.

The foregoing policies are applicable to all Sinclair employees at all levels of the institution, and set high standards for legal and ethical conduct of employees (addresses Core component 2.A).

Special consideration is given in the *Faculty Handbook* to legal and ethical questions that relate to faculty and their academic responsibilities. Policies on ethical behavior in textbook selection, ethical concerns with student behaviors, conflict of interest, intellectual property, academic integrity, additional employment and compensation, faculty research involving human subjects, and acceptable use of information technology are clearly and explicitly stated in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Sinclair employs a full-time attorney who is available to provide College leaders with legal advice. In addition, explicit ethics policies guide the activities of the Business Services division, which is comprised of the Bookstore, Food Service, Mail Center, Parking, and Purchasing. The department is also responsible for oversight of the college’s insurance, property acquisition, liability avoidance and general business activity.

- **Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents (2.B.)**

The primary mechanism for providing information to potential students and the public at large is the Sinclair website (*www.sinclair.edu*), which is the main means of disseminating information regarding programs, requirements, etc. (addresses Core component 2.B).

When visiting the Sinclair webpage, the first link the viewer encounters in the upper left-hand corner is a link to “Academic Programs.” Upon clicking the link, the viewer is taken to a page showing all academic programs along with links to the program description and curriculum. The website provides hints that help students determine whether they might be interested in the program, as can be seen in *Figure 4.23*, which provides a screen shot of the Accounting webpage that is accessed from the Academic Programs webpage.

Sinclair also provides information on requirements for admission, accessible by clicking the “Get Started” link on the main webpage. As an open enrollment institution, with few exceptions Sinclair accepts all students, as can be seen in *Figure 4.24* (see *www.sinclair.edu/explore/bestroad/*). This page also has a link to Placement Testing information to help students understand the role and importance of placement testing and how to prepare.
Sinclair’s tuition and fee rates are readily available online (see www.sinclair.edu/services/bursar/cfs/). Figure 4.25 displays the tuition and fee information from the college’s website.

Sinclair also provides a Net Price Calculator (see www.sinclair.edu/services/finaid/calc/) to help students calculate the costs of attending Sinclair. Figure 4.26 provides an example of results from use of the Net Price Calculator.

There are a number of areas on the Sinclair website where accreditation information can be found. An excellent resource for information on Sinclair is the “About Sinclair” page, which is readily accessible from the main webpage (see www.sinclair.edu/about/) (addresses Core component 2.B.). On the left of this page is a link to accreditation information (see www.sinclair.edu/about/information/accreditation/), and as can be seen in Figure 4.27, additional links are provided with information regarding AQIP at Sinclair (www.sinclair.edu/about/aqip/) and regarding individual program/department accreditations (www.sinclair.edu/about/information/accreditation/accrediting-agencies/index.cfm).
What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

One important measure regarding Sinclair’s institutional integrity comes from a PACE item which asks respondents to rate “the extent to which unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to me.” As Figure 4.28 indicates, on the whole Sinclair employees indicate that integrity and ethical behavior are encouraged through the identification and correction of unacceptable behaviors.

It should be noted that ratings for this item have increased since the 2004 and 2007 administration, with a statistically significant increase between the 2007 and 2010 administrations of PACE.

Section 4R3 reported PACE results for the item “the extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution” and noted a statistically significant increase in mean ratings for this item from 3.51 to 3.75 between the 2010 and 2013 PACE administrations (see Figure 4.16 in section 4R3). This provides another internal validation of the commitment to ethical practices at Sinclair.

Moreover, ratings are also high for the PACE item “the extent to which I perceive there to be individual accountability,” which would include accountability for ethical conduct in the performance of the responsibilities associated with one’s position, with a statistically significant increase between 2010 and 2013. Figure 4.29 displays these results.

External confirmation regarding the integrity of Sinclair’s leadership and organization processes and practices comes from the January 2014 Community Leader Survey. Community leaders rated Sinclair on a number of factors on a scale from 1 (very ineffective) to 5 (very effective). As can be seen in Figure 4.30, Sinclair received a mean rating of 4.2 for stewardship, which would indicate that on the whole community leaders felt that Sinclair manages resources in a way that is appropriate and ethical. The overall rating of 4.5 provides a general affirmation that the college is very effective at meeting the needs of the community in a responsive and responsible manner.

Some indication of ethical conduct at Sinclair in general can be found in the Crime Statistics reports required by the Jeanne Cleary Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. Figure 4.31 displays Sinclair’s Cleary Crime Statistics for 2011 – 2013. It should be noted that only incidents in columns labeled (a) and (b) occurred on property owned by Sinclair, whereas column (c) is adjacent public streets and sidewalks.

Cost of college attendance is an important indication of an institution’s efforts to act with integrity in providing educational value for students who attend and taxpayers who support public institutions. Sinclair has the lowest tuition and fees in the state of Ohio for all public community colleges by a considerable margin, as can be seen in Figure 4.32.
### Figure 4.31
Clergy Crime Statistics for 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder/Non-Negligent Manslaughter</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligent Manslaughter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses - Incendous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses - Non-incendous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Rape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating Violence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crimes (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arrests for Disciplinary Action**
- Weapons: carrying, possessing: 0 3 5 1 1 1 4
- Drug Abuse Violations: 4 20 16 6 3 3 13 0 12
- Liquor Law Violations: 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 7

**Referrals for Disciplinary Action**
- Weapons: carrying, possessing: 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0
- Drug Abuse Violations: 5 0 11 1 0 0 0 0 0
- Liquor Law Violations: 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0

### Table Notes
- a = On campus
- b = Non-campus buildings or property (any building or property owned or controlled by Sinclair that is used in direct support or in relation to Sinclair’s educational purpose, is frequently used by students, and is not within the same reasonably contiguous geographic area of Sinclair).
- c = Public property (adjacent public streets and sidewalks.)
- (1) = Hate crimes are crimes that manifest evidence that the victim was intentionally selected because of their actual or perceived race, gender, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnicity, or disability of the victim.

---

### Figure 4.32
Ohio Public Community College Tuition and Fees – Sorted Lowest to Highest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Published In-District Tuition and Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Community College</td>
<td>$2,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>$2,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Gateway Community College</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland Community College</td>
<td>$2,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark State Community College</td>
<td>$2,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State Community College</td>
<td>$2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central State College</td>
<td>$2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens Community College</td>
<td>$3,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark State College</td>
<td>$3,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest State Community College</td>
<td>$3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern State Community College</td>
<td>$3,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes State College</td>
<td>$3,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Community College</td>
<td>$3,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Community College</td>
<td>$3,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ohio Technical College</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking College</td>
<td>$3,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra State Community College</td>
<td>$3,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont College</td>
<td>$3,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane State College</td>
<td>$3,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Technical College</td>
<td>$4,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati State Technical &amp; Community College</td>
<td>$4,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Community College</td>
<td>$18,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ohio Board of Regents (www.ohiohighered.org/college-portraits)
AQIP CATEGORY FIVE: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP

CATEGORY INTRODUCTION
In the past decade Sinclair has invested in efficient, robust systems for the dissemination of knowledge that help ensure the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of knowledge management at the institution. The DAWN (Data Warehouse, Analysis, and iNtelligence) Portal, first developed in 2006, is an online reporting tool that has become the institution's primary means of disseminating data to internal stakeholders. Custom built reports allow for 24/7 access to information that is updated daily on course and program enrollment, degree completion, course success, faculty payload, average class size, and a multitude of other data points that provide decision-makers with the information they need at the click of a button. Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR) frequently develops new reports on the DAWN Portal at the request of end users.

To a greater extent than a decade ago Sinclair employees agree in PACE ratings that (1) information is shared across the institution, (2) they receive information related to their work, (3) the information that they receive is useful to their work, and (4) data are used in decision making. Much of this increased data use is directly attributable to the growing impact of the DAWN Portal over the past ten years. The DAWN Portal is currently being supplemented by a new online tool, SAS Visual Analytics, that promises to provide even greater access in an even more rapid and user-friendly manner to decision makers at the college.

One important use of these data is in building the budget for the college. Based on information from the DAWN data warehouse and other sources, Sinclair creates an annual "Budget Book" which provides a comprehensive analysis of the current financial climate, particularly in terms of revenues and expenditures. Moreover, the Budget Book lays out the budget development rationale for the coming year, and provides the recommendations for the budget prior to Sinclair Board of Trustees' approval. This document plays a pivotal role in the allocation and assignment of resources to achieve organizational goals. On the basis of the priorities and guidelines laid out by the Budget Book, Sinclair builds its budget for the year and empowers budget managers to make data-informed requests.

Sinclair has a well-established, well-supported Information Technology (IT) Division consisting of nine areas, each with a specific role in meeting the information technology needs of the institution. An annually developed IT Master Plan describes, prioritizes and guides the upcoming year's projects. In addition, IT uses consultants to track their performance against industry benchmarks, which guides the identification of areas of improvement.

Almost 10% of Sinclair's operating budget is devoted to Plant Operations and Maintenance, representing an FY 2014 investment of some $12 million dollars, indicating that the physical infrastructure of the college is well-resourced. In addition, 23 full-time Police Officers and 70 part-time Security Information Officers secure the safety of Sinclair’s locations.

Sinclair prioritizes risk management, using its strategic priorities to guide risk assessment, utilizing local, state, and national relationships to provide a means of gathering information on possible impending threats, and utilizing the expert counsel of a full-time attorney to reduce risk. A solid, thoughtful financial planning process and heavy reliance on both internal and external audits provide an additional bulwark against risk.

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF PROCESSES FOR CATEGORY 5: INTEGRATED

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF RESULTS FOR CATEGORY 5: INTEGRATED

CATEGORY RESPONSES

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

5P1 Knowledge Management focuses on how data, information, and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution. Describe the processes for knowledge management and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Selecting, organizing, analyzing, and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement, and decision-making
- Determining data, information, and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively
- Making data, information, and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning, and improvements
- Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes
In the past decade Sinclair has experienced a true revolution in its approach to the analysis and distribution of data. Previously Sinclair’s Office of Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR) performed much of its research primarily through queries in the live student records database, a time-consuming and inefficient process. RAR manually generated and distributed e-mail or hard copy reports. End users relied heavily on these e-mailed or hard copy reports, and had only limited ability to gather data on their own on an as-needed basis.

Sinclair developed the Data Warehouse, Analysis, and iNtelligence (DAWN) Portal in 2006, and it has since become the primary delivery mechanism of institutional data to end-users. Each evening DAWN captures student records from Colleague (the College’s ERP system) for future access by users. DAWN runs on the SAS Institute (SAS) business intelligence architecture, and has empowered end users with the capability to access information 24/7, without the need for institutional research personnel to capture, analyze, and report those data to them. All College personnel have access to DAWN’s data analysis tools via the Intranet whether they are on or off campus. Through easy exports into Excel or other applications, all employees have ready access to an entire universe of data associated with the Sinclair enterprise. This has not only substantially increased end user access to data, but has freed up institutional research resources to move away from time-consuming, rote reporting to address more complex analyses and more sophisticated research.

The DAWN Portal is accessed through the College’s intranet and requires secure login. Security protocols ensure that once signed in, end users only have access to data that are appropriate for their role, although most users have access to the majority of reports.

Upon logging into the DAWN Portal, users select from a number of tabs organizing the DAWN reports into different areas. Sinclair’s enrollment management reports, available during the registration period for each term, include the following:

- **FTE Comparison Report.** Provides FTE enrollment from the comparison date from registration for the term the previous year, with the ability to filter by division, department, and subject.
- **FTE Comparison Report by Site.** Same as above, with breakdowns in FTE enrollment for Sinclair’s Learning Centers and the Courseview location.
- **Headcount Comparison.** Provides unduplicated headcount comparisons with the comparison date from the previous year.
- **FTE by Division and Fiscal Year 14th and 30th.** Provides historic data on FTE enrollment by division and department for both the census date on the 14th day of the term and for the final capture date 30 days after the end of the term.

- **Overall Student Demographics.** Provides demographic information for all students enrolled at that point in the registration cycle, including gender, ethnicity, age, enrollment status, division of degree program, and county/ZIP code.
- **Dayton/Englewood/Huber Heights/Preble/Courseview Student Demographics.** Several reports with the same information as above, only broken out for specific Sinclair locations.
- **The Top 100 Report – Dayton Campus Only.** Provides enrollment comparisons for the previous five years.
- **Enrollment Status Compare Report.** Compares enrollment by different enrollment status groups (new, continuing, high school, etc.) between the current date and the comparison date from the previous year.

This is only a small sampling of the many reports available to help college personnel manage enrollment during the registration period and beyond.

Another tab, “Program Review / Payload,” provides departments undergoing Program Review with needed information to complete their self-study, although the information is valuable for many other purposes. Example of reports included in this area of the DAWN Portal include:

- **Program Review Courses.** Provides historic seatcount course enrollments for the department that is selected, with breakdowns by ethnicity, gender, and age group.
- **Program Review Programs.** Provides historic data showing enrollment in academic programs for a specific department, with breakdowns by ethnicity, gender, and age group.
- **Degree Completion.** Displays historic degree completion information for the selected department.
- **Course Success Rates.** Provides historic course success rates (ABCP = success, DFNUW = non-success) for the selected department.
- **Faculty Payload Report by Academic Year.** Provides Faculty payload data for all faculty from the selected department, providing full-time or part-time status, pay hour information, and other data.
- **Faculty Payload Report for a Specific Faculty.** Same as above for a specific faculty member.
- **Payhour Performance Report.** Lists the trends in full-time compared to part-time payload hours for the selected department.

Department chairpersons find the “Chair’s Toolkit” tab helpful. Some of the reports in the “Program Review/Payload” tab are also available in this tab, along with other reports, including the following:

- **Instruction Pay Hours Per FTE Report.** Displays instruction pay hours per FTE as of the 1st and 14th day of classes.
- **Reassign Pay Hours Per FTE Report.** Displays reassign pay hour per FTE as of the 1st and 14th day of classes.
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- **Section Enrollment Report with Comments.** Allows for enrollment management – allows chairs to list sections with enrollment below a specified minimum, and see any comments attached to those sections.

- **Pre-14th Day Average Class Size and FTE Report.** Provides Average Class Size data during the registration period for the purposes of enrollment management.

- **Program Student Retention.** Provides data on term-to-term enrollment for students in the selected program of study.

The reports available on these tabs represent only a small fraction of the information available in the DAWN Portal. Other reports can be found utilizing the DAWN Portal search function. In some cases, reports have been tailored to specific stakeholders on request; these reports may be available to all or restricted to a specific requestor. This is also true of End of Course Student Survey results used for course assessments. Results are available through the DAWN Portal; however, the reports hold security restrictions to allow access only by the faculty member and, in the case of adjuncts and annually contracted faculty, the appropriate department chair and division dean.

For the past decade the DAWN Portal has set a new standard at Sinclair for accessibility, timeliness, and reliability of information that is disseminated to college constituent groups. The accuracy of the data is regularly reviewed by RAR personnel, and security is in place to ensure that information is only shared with those college employees for whom it is appropriate. College leaders have a substantially increased capacity to access data for decision making relative to a decade ago, and it has had a tremendous impact on the institution’s ability to utilize data for decision making.

Within the past year RAR has begun using a new SAS tool for disseminating information, SAS Visual Analytics. While the DAWN Portal has been revolutionary in terms of how data are shared across the institution, the SAS Visual Analytics platform offers considerably faster data retrieval and substantially more flexibility in the manner in which data are displayed. An example of an exciting new report in SAS Visual Analytics – the Performance Based Funding Dashboard - was shared in sections 2P2 and 2R2 (see Figure 2.12 for a detailed explanation of the Performance Based Funding Dashboard). This tool holds tremendous promise in helping leadership at Sinclair identify areas of improvement related to the new state funding model, with access via both PCs and mobile devices.

Another new report in SAS Visual Analytics offers an opportunity to increase chairpersons’ ability to manage section enrollment during the registration period, the "Average Class Size Analysis Tool." Besides providing an overall snapshot of the average class size at the institution – stratified by location – the tool also allows deans and chair to select lists of sections by location, meeting date, seatcount, and full/A term/B term/flex section to determine the impact cancelling a section will have on average class size for the department. By selecting these options, departments can determine ACS impact if, for example, they cancelled all sections with five or fewer enrollments. While departments have always had ACS targets built into the budget for that department, in the past chairpersons often felt that they weren't given the tools necessary to manage enrollment to that ACS target. The "Average Class Size Analysis Tool" provides chairs with the information they need to more efficiently manage course offerings, and the Excel export function allows for easy transfer of the data to software programs used by chairpersons and their administrative assistants.

Another new report that RAR has developed in SAS Visual Analytics, the “General Ledger and Hourly Employee Report,” provides data on allotted budgets and year-to-date expenditures against those budgets, providing budget managers with up-to-date information on financial data related to their accounts.

Development of the reports mentioned in this section is accomplished by RAR, but is always done either at the request of another stakeholder group or in collaboration with the intended audience. For example, RAR created the “Chair’s Toolkit” tab in the DAWN Portal at the request of the Associate Provost. On the other hand, RAR generated the idea for the "Average Class Size Analysis Tool" but worked closely with the Provost’s Office in developing the tool and the various components that were included in it. RAR personnel frequently visit Provost’s Council, where they discuss different aspects of these various reports, and receive feedback and suggestions for increasing the value for end users. The Office of Strategic Enrollment Management also works very closely with RAR, frequently requesting the development of reports to help better manage enrollment. Finally, in many cases reports from the data warehouse have been developed at the request of the President to provide timely data required for high-level decision making.

5R1 What are the results for determining how data, information, and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized (including software platforms and/or contracted services)
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

Section 5P1 described the outcomes measures tracked and the tools utilized at Sinclair in great detail. The DAWN Portal is the primary provider of institutional data to decision makers at the institution, although in recent months SAS Visual
Analytics reports have become available and will in the future replace many of the DAWN Portal reports. There is no question that over the past decade the development of the DAWN Portal has put a vastly increased amount of data at the fingertips of decision makers at Sinclair. The key question is whether or not data are being used to a greater extent.

Fortunately, the PACE survey provides some valuable information regarding the use of data at Sinclair. With the emergence of the DAWN Portal, one would expect an increase in PACE ratings related to the sharing of data at the institution. Figure 5.1 provides evidence of this. The increases (statistically significant between 2010 and 2013) seen in recent years are attributable to the increased use of the DAWN Portal.

Figure 5.2 breaks this information down by employee group (administration, faculty, professional, and support). It is interesting to note that increases appear to be most dramatic for administration, who would presumably be the decision makers most likely to be using data. However, the increases seem for faculty and support staff are almost as encouraging: note that faculty ratings trended with professional respondents up until the 2013 survey, when faculty experienced a marked increase in mean ratings.

These rating results were further reflected in the item regarding “the extent to which information I receive is useful to my work,” as can be seen in Figure 5.4 (the same statistically significant increase in mean rating was seen between 2010 and 2013).

These results provide evidence that data are shared to a greater extent, and that employees feel more strongly that useful information is shared with them. The key PACE question related to this issue, however, is “the extent to which the use of data in decision making and assessment occurs.” Fortunately, the most impressive increases in mean ratings of those shared in this section are for this item, as can be seen in Figure 5.5 (increases between 2010 and 2013 are again statistically significant). Responses to this item provide the strongest evidence yet that not only has an increased amount of data been made available to employees at Sinclair, but that data is being used by decision makers to a greater extent than in the past. It should be noted that respondents in the “administration” category had by far the highest ratings on this item.
Based on 5R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The best evidence we have, presented in section 5R1, indicates that Sinclair employees report having (1) access to data to a greater extent than they have in the past, (2) more information related to their work, (3) more information that is useful to their work, and most importantly, (4) report that they use data to a greater extent in decision making and assessment. This increase can be attributed, at least in part, to increasing use of the DAWN Portal from its inception in 2006 and its expanded use in the years following. It has taken some time to acclimate users to this new mode of obtaining institutional data, but it appears that it has led to increased use of data at Sinclair.

As mentioned in 5P1, Sinclair recently acquired a new platform for disseminating data to the campus, the SAS Visual Analytics tool. Improvements in the next several years will involve development of new, faster, more user-friendly online reports. Thus far all new reports in SAS Visual Analytics have been developed in close collaboration between RAR and end users, and it is anticipated that this will continue to be the case. Reliance on these reports will likely increase, as Sinclair leverages the Performance Based Funding Dashboard to provide data that are used to increase Sinclair’s share of state subsidy.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. Describe the processes for managing resources and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Maintaining fiscal, physical, and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)
- Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities, and emerging needs (5.A.3)
- Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)

Fiscal infrastructures at Sinclair are ultimately overseen by the President and the Board of Trustees, although responsibility for fiscal processes resides with Sinclair’s Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, supported by the Office of Budget and Analysis. Each year the Office of Budget and Analysis distributes the "Budget Book," which is a summary of the operating budget for the college for the coming fiscal year, including factors influencing revenues and expenditures. It details the work of 130 budget managers across roughly 180 responsibility centers. In addition to the expected revenues and expenditures, the Budget Book provides an analysis of the recommendations presented to the Board of Trustees, a staffing summary, and an expansive trend analysis with operational statistics. The budget analyses contained in the book guide the financial activities of the college throughout the fiscal year.

The Budget Book is divided into four main sections:

- **Section 1 -- Revenue and Expenditure**
  Summary: Summary of revenues and expenditures by major functional category and related charts.

- **Section 2 -- Budget Discussion and Analysis:**
  Reproduction of the Budget Recommendation as approved by the Board of Trustees.

- **Section 3 -- Staffing Summary:**
  Charts and tables depicting budgeted staffing composition by type and functional category.

- **Section 4 -- Trend Analysis:**
  Tables, charts and analysis of recent trends in revenues, expenses, fund balances and key operational statistics.

**Figure 5.6** displays Sinclair’s revenue sources, along with the percent of total revenue each accounted for from FY 2001 through FY 2014. Except for a relatively small percent of revenue, Sinclair is...
As can be seen, the category with by far the largest expenditures is Instruction, with 53.7% of the operating budget, followed by Student Support at 13.7%, Institutional Support at 11.6%, and Academic Support at 11.3%, with the remaining 9.7% accounted for by Plant Operations and Maintenance. Together Instruction, Student Support, and Academic Support account for of 78.7% of expenditures (addresses Core component 5.A.2). Sinclair Community College has always demonstrated strong fiscal stewardship in meeting the demand for its programs and services, which is especially important during these uncertain economic times. For Fiscal Year 2011 Sinclair was the only two-year institution of higher education in the University System of Ohio (USO), and one of only two institutions overall, to post a perfect 5.0 composite score of financial health as calculated pursuant to the Campus Financial Accountability standards required by Senate Bill 6 of the 122nd General Assembly of the State of Ohio. This result is simply the latest in a long history of exemplary performance on this metric, underscoring Sinclair's commitment to prudent management of scarce public resources.

As a not-for-profit public institution, Sinclair's economic health does not serve as an end in its own right, but rather positions the college to meet its educational mission with predictable results while avoiding wide variances in quality and availability. Such strength has allowed the college to adapt to the dramatic enrollment growth realized over the FY 2008 through 2011 timeframe and the subsequent retrenchment that has occurred since then, with minimal disruption to its stakeholders. Historically, revenues have consistently outpaced expenditures at Sinclair: see Figure 5.9 in section 5R2 (addresses Core component 5.A.1).

The Budget Book also provides Board of Trustees’ Budget Recommendations as approved in their June meeting. In this section of the Budget Book, the College sets goals and strategies aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities, and emerging needs (addresses Core component 5.A.3). For example, Figure 5.8 displays the strategies developed as part of the FY 2014 Budget Book.

While the Budget Book provides high level planning and strategies for the coming fiscal year, other processes implement them. The Capital Budget Request process provides a streamlined approach for allocating resources with several levels of review which employs safeguards to ensure prioritization and resource allocation of the activities that support the college's mission and goals. (addresses Core component 5.A.3). In keeping with the college-wide strategic priorities, each funding unit identifies strategic objectives (major projects) for the next fiscal year based on comprehensive needs analyses and prioritization. Through the college-wide budget and planning cycle, the College analyzes all new and existing funding requests based upon anticipated enrollment, state funding, and levy income based on planning, goals and strategies from the Budget Book. The approved requests receive funding based on alignment with the college's mission, current goals and strategies. Budget managers enter Capital Budget Requests through an online electronic form. This data entry process saves administrative time and costs, allows for more review time, and reduces the chances for error as duplicate manual data entry has largely been eliminated. All budget managers have access beginning in November, with a mid-January deadline for submitting their Capital Budget Requests.

The general process is as follows:

- Budget Managers enter requests directly into the database. Requests not funded in a prior cycle need to be re-submitted via this process if the department wishes for them to again be considered for funding.

- Deans/Directors and Vice Presidents approve requests electronically via the College's workflow approval process. This system allows the supervisory participants in the overall process to:
  - Approve the request for further consideration
  - Reject the request outright, or
  - Reject the request and return it to the requestor for edit and re-submission

- Vice Presidents prioritize their initially approved requests by type:
  - Construction and Change of Function
  - Equipment Only

- Facilities Management and Information

**Strategy Going Forward**

Since the resource outlook is likely to not get better anytime soon, the college’s fiscal planning efforts will endeavor to address the following strategies:

- Continue the focus on student success and completion so that the college’s performance results in a fair share of funding from the new state funding formula

- Intensify efforts to identify opportunities for strategic reallocation to create “budget capacity” from within and ensure that limited resources are most optimally allocated to their “highest and best use”

- Continue focus on driving efficiencies in instructional delivery and program service areas post conversion to the semester calendar
Technology evaluates the prioritized requests for items such as cost assumptions or technical requirements.
- President’s Cabinet convenes to determine the requests that will go forward to the Board of Trustees for recommendation for funding approval.

In managing educational resources, Sinclair uses several metrics to determine allocation and usage efficiencies. For example, as has been noted in previous sections, as part of its fiscal strategy to regulate instructional personnel costs, the college strives to maintain a 50/50 ratio between full-time and part-time instructors. This ratio provides a metric for guiding staffing decisions in Instruction, and plays a significant role in determining when the College fills or reallocates an open position.

An important measure of efficiency in resource management in Instruction is the Average Class Size metric (ACS). The ACS is a rough indicator of the number of students per section relative to instructor payload for the section, with higher ACS numbers indicating a greater number of students per section and more efficient use of instructional resources. The Office of Budget and Analysis provides departments with ACS targets based on the budget that has been built for the year; Sinclair expects department chairpersons to manage section enrollment and staffing to reach those targets. Section 5I2 will describe a number of tools that have been developed to help department chairpersons more effectively manage enrollment to meet ACS targets.

What are the results for resource management?
- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation results and insights gained

Figure 5.9 displays the revenues and expenses per FTE since FY 2001 (in 2014 dollars). Revenues have consistently outpaced expenditures at Sinclair, with the exception of FY 2004.

Evidence for Sinclair’s solid financial health in the face of declining state support, while at the same time raising tuition at a much lower rate compared to other public Ohio community colleges and universities, as can be seen in Figure 5.11.

Figure 5.12 displays historic information on expenditures by percent of total from FY 2001 through FY 2014. The three areas directly related to students – Instruction, Academic Support, and Student Services – accounted for between 76% and 80% of expenditures in each year, which indicates that Sinclair has been extremely consistent in its resource expenditures directly for education across this time period. On the expense side, the incurrence of costs among the major functional categories has remained somewhat stable over time. External benchmarking has shown that the college allocates a higher percent of budget to instruction, academic support and student services and a lower percent to institutional support (administrative overhead) than its peers.
As noted in the previous section, in managing Instructional personnel costs Sinclair attempts to maintain a 50/50 ratio of full-time to part-time instructors in staffing for-credit offerings. Figure 5.13 demonstrates that in the past several years Sinclair has done an excellent job of managing to this ratio.

To efficiently manage instructional staffing costs, the College consistently challenges itself to attain and improve upon its Average Class Size (ACS) metric. Figure 5.14 displays the trend in average class size (ACS). Historically, ACS has generally tracked enrollment changes year over year, with improvements resulting from natural efficiencies attributable to enrollment volume in excess of planned levels. In FY 2010 ACS peaked at 19.9, when the college experienced rapidly rising enrollment levels. Now that the semester transition has been completed and the college has increased the focus on ACS, a rise in this efficiency metric is projected. Sinclair leadership anticipate recent enhancements in reporting and analysis, discussed in more detail in 512, will drive decision making to reduce the number of low enrollment sections and further boost class size efficiency.

Based on 5R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Recognizing that personnel expenditures represent by far the greatest expenditures by Sinclair, and that the number of Instructional faculty personnel by far outweigh personnel in all other areas, the College realizes the importance of the Average Class Size (ACS) metric in managing costs and improving efficiency. It is crucial to the financial health of the college to take steps to effectively manage ACS, through combining low enrollment sections, thoughtfully building a course schedule based on enrollment data from recent terms, and other measures.

To this end, Sinclair developed new online tools to assist chairs in building course schedules and managing enrollment. The first of these tools is the Course Planning Tool, which is designed to provide key information for use by department chairpersons as they build a course schedule for the upcoming term. The report has two tabs providing valuable information for chairs in making decisions about scheduling sections:

- Daily Section Enrollment History. This tab displays enrollment in a given department across the registration period for a term to help chairpersons understand how enrollment has grown over the registration period in the past and when maximum enrollment has been reached. This helps guide decision making as to when to cancel sections, providing historic information on the typical point in the registration cycle where the majority of enrollments for a term has been reached in past terms. Chairs select information on specific courses, sites, meeting times, and other variables to see how enrollment varies in different types of sections.

- Historical Average Class Size. This tab shows historical information on past average class size, along with the targeted average class size for the coming term. It also displays the courses that the department has committed to offer for the coming year in the Two Year Planning Guide. Chairpersons select information for specific courses and sites as they build the schedule for the upcoming term.
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The College first introduced the Course Planning Tool in Fall 2014, along with chairperson training sessions conducted to help chairpersons learn to use the tool in Spring 2015 scheduling. It is hoped that use of the tool will lead to better informed and more efficient course scheduling in the terms to come.

A second tool that has recently been developed to help chairs manage Average Class Size is the Average Class Size tool, which is designed for use during the registration period. This tool was described in detail in section 5P1.

It is hoped that the Course Planning Tool and the Average Class Size tool will help chairs be more efficient in building course schedules prior to registration for the term, and help them more effectively manage the number of sections initially offered each term. The College will need some time to assess whether these new tools have made an impact on Average Class Size.

Section 5P3 described the Budget Book and descriptions of key processes for:

- Operational Effectiveness
- Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)

Operational Effectiveness focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. Describe the processes for operational effectiveness and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals

Sinclair’s budget process begins in the late fall. Budget managers receive targeted information regarding overall revenue and expenditures to help them understand the fiscal environment surrounding the development of the budget for the year. The Budget Office provides information regarding changes in enrollment, state funding, levy funding, student tuition/fees, and other data points that lead to the development of a shared understanding among budget managers regarding the financial climate that must guide budgetary decisions. Budget managers begin development of core and discretionary requests, with information available in the DAWN Portal to help in decision-making. Budget managers prioritize requests relative to Sinclair’s mission and core strategies. The College requires division budget managers to thoughtfully reallocate resources within their respective units before they seek any supplemental resources. The various budget managers submit prioritized electronic requests to the next level supervisors. As the requests reach the Vice President level, senior leaders re-prioritize to reflect the requests of that Division; then, during President’s Cabinet, leaders again re-prioritize to ensure alignment and coordination of the entire college-wide budget across the college with attention to the mission and strategic priorities.

Budget managers do this work in close collaboration with the Office of Budget and Analysis. In addition, the Director of the Office of Budget and Analysis has an annual meeting with each academic department chairperson to determine the number of course sections to be offered for the year. The budget for the department incorporates the determined number of sections; these data also help in development of the Average Class Size targets.

Sinclair’s budget process begins in the late fall. Budget managers receive targeted information regarding overall revenue and expenditures to help them understand the fiscal environment surrounding the development of the budget for the year. The Budget Office provides information regarding changes in enrollment, state funding, levy funding, student tuition/fees, and other data points that lead to the development of a shared understanding among budget managers regarding the financial climate that must guide budgetary decisions. Budget managers begin development of core and discretionary requests, with information available in the DAWN Portal to help in decision-making. Budget managers prioritize requests relative to Sinclair’s mission and core strategies. The College requires division budget managers to thoughtfully reallocate resources within their respective units before they seek any supplemental resources. The various budget managers submit prioritized electronic requests to the next level supervisors. As the requests reach the Vice President level, senior leaders re-prioritize to reflect the requests of that Division; then, during President’s Cabinet, leaders again re-prioritize to ensure alignment and coordination of the entire college-wide budget across the college with attention to the mission and strategic priorities.

Budget managers do this work in close collaboration with the Office of Budget and Analysis. In addition, the Director of the Office of Budget and Analysis has an annual meeting with each academic department chairperson to determine the number of course sections to be offered for the year. The budget for the department incorporates the determined number of sections; these data also help in development of the Average Class Size targets.

• Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)

The FY 2014 Budget Book provides an excellent example of how Sinclair monitors its financial position and adjusts budgets accordingly. The Budget Book is created annually, and represents a well-developed process for budgeting and for monitoring expenses (addresses Core component 5.A.2). The College performs other similar analyses every year. In FY 2014, two key assumptions significantly impacted the construction of the FY 2014 budget:

• The State of Ohio is in the process of developing a two-year budget. Until the State announces the final details of the budget, the College faces uncertainty and possible variation of the assumptions built into the college’s budget for state subsidy and tuition caps.

• Sinclair has recently experienced declining FTE enrollments attributable to an improving economy, normal business cycle fluctuations and, most significantly, a conversion to a...
semester-based calendar. In light of this trend and the still relative newness of the semester calendar (Summer 2013 was the first summer term offered under the semester format) a presumed conservative enrollment forecast is budgeted (a 1.2% overall increase attributable to the Courseview location expansion). This integral planning assumption drove construction of all components of the financial plan for FY 2014.

Sinclair examined the following factors in an analysis of key revenue, expense, and transfer elements of the entire consolidated college operating budget in the FY 2014 Budget Book:

**Revenues:**
- State Share of Instruction (SSI), although still a significant contributor to the college's revenue stream at 33% of the total, continued on a downward trend in terms of relative contribution. Sinclair's projected allocation for FY 2014 is $7 million less than it received in FY 2009 (-15%) despite the fact that enrollment is about the same for the two years.
- Montgomery County Levy revenues are predicted to decline by 1.0% in relation to FY 2013 in light of continued degradation in real estate valuations in the County. The latest feedback from the Montgomery County Auditor's Office regarding the ongoing revaluation project indicates that valuations are likely to decline further in the near term, meaning levy revenues may continue to deteriorate.
- Tuition and Fees (Credit Based), comprise the single largest revenue category in the college's general fund with a share of nearly 40%. This category is forecast to increase by $3.0 million or 6.5% overall as the product of: a) $1.4 million from the implementation of tuition increases approved by the Board in March; b) $0.5 million from the aforementioned nominal improvement in budgeted enrollment; and c) $1.1 million from a change in the practice of writing off student accounts that will result in an increase in reported student fee revenue.
- Workforce Development income shows a substantial increase (+12.4%) from FY 2013’s revised budget, driven by an improving local economy yielding more demand for non-credit training and related services and the additional capabilities afforded the division by the opening of Courseview Building "B;" a little over 33% of the total increase is expected to derive from the dedicated corporate training space there.
- Investment Income is held flat at the FY 2013 level despite projecting both a lower rate of return on the portfolio and a slightly lower average investable reserve balance. Maintaining the allocation of investment earnings at this amount will necessarily mean a lower allocation of investment earnings to the capital fund.
- Other income is the summary of indirect cost recovery from grants and contracts, sales of services (other than through the division of Workforce Development), investment

**Expenses:**
- Personnel costs are those related to direct compensation, including salaries, wages, and fringe benefits paid to the full- and part-time employees of the college. This category can be further broken down into three major headings:
  1. Full-time positions (faculty, support and professional staff, administration); the budgeted fringe benefit load rate for full-time positions is approximately 31.5%
  2. Part-time faculty (adjunct pay and overload and summer pay for full-time faculty for work beyond their base contract)
  3. Student and Other Hourly (wages paid to student and other part-time staff employees)
- Non-personnel expenses cover all items other than those described in the Personnel section. For purposes of budget development, this category is typically further broken out into three subgroups:
  1. Discretionary (supplies, travel, special events and other expenses over which the college can exercise a fairly high degree of latitude.)
  2. Non-discretionary (expenditures that by their nature are largely fixed in the near term due to operational or contractual requirements, e.g., leases, utilities, software licenses.)
  3. Strategic Initiatives (typically one-time allocations made for targeted purposes. It is possible that eventually these monies would flow into other categories, such as personnel, but that detail is not known at this time.)

As the foregoing example from the FY 2014 Budget Book demonstrates, Sinclair has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and monitoring expenses (addresses Core component 5.A.5), and systematically monitors its financial position and adjusts budgets accordingly.

- **Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly**

Sinclair’s Information Technology (IT) division consists of nine area functions:
- Information Security. The primary goal of Sinclair’s Information Security area is to assure the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information collected, created, shared, or otherwise used in support of the learning, research, and community/public service mission of the College.
- Application Administration. Application Administration provides software design, development, maintenance and overall architecture of the institutional business systems to help create the vision that defines the direction required to ensure the needs of the college are met. Application Administration consists of five senior programmers, two system administrators and an application administrator. Software programs supported by Application Administration are widely used across the college, including the Colleague student records system and the College’s Learning Management System.

- Application Delivery. Application Delivery is responsible for the management of physical and virtual desktops. This includes building the core desktop images and maintaining the management services for the desktops, including patching and virus scanning. The department also delivers software to the desktops, whether installed locally or delivered on-demand via Microsoft App-V and the Citrix Xen environment.

- Application Development. This area within IT is responsible for the design, development, maintenance and overall architecture of websites and web-based applications services. Application Development seeks to deliver technologies that address the strategic goals and vision of the institution by effectively communicating with functional departments to understand and provide the best approach and use of web-based technology.

- End-User Computing. End-User Computing provides technical support to the campus locations. Technicians provide first-level support for desktop hardware: PCs, Macs, printers, scanners, podiums, copiers and Sinclair issued accessories. They provide second level support for the campus Help Desk, Windows Operating Image and Office Applications for the users.

- Network Operations Center. The Network Operations Center(NOC) maintains the physical infrastructure of Sinclair Community College’s Data Center. Leveraging the power of HP OpenView to provide automated monitoring and alerting services for over 300 servers and thousands of network devices, this area gathers performance measurement and troubleshooting information for mission critical college services, including Angel and Colleague. The NOC oversees backup, restore, and disaster recovery functionality for all Sinclair business-critical servers.

- Server-Based Computing. Server-Based Computing is made up of Systems Engineers who are responsible for the management, planning, and implementation of the infrastructure services that are used by Sinclair students, faculty, and staff such as user personal drive data storage, departmental shares, college-wide email services, and even remote access to files.

- Telecommunications. The IT Telecommunications team manages the IT Network Infrastructure, Voice communications and administration, and Multimedia Systems administration on the Dayton Campus and Remote Learning Centers. This area manages the use of digital, analog and cellular phone communication, controls the access to and from wired and wireless computing devices and aids in the instruction process by maintaining classroom and conference room multimedia equipment.

- User Support. User Support includes the IT Help Desk, IT Labs, Multimedia Event Support, and IT Policies and Procedures. The IT Help Desk provides telephone support for students, faculty and staff, and is the single primary point of contact for technology related issues. IT Labs provide in-person support for students, coordination and support of IT classrooms for employees, and ensure availability of hardware and software resources. Multimedia Event Support assures that multimedia resources and services are available when required for the Corporate Conference Center, videoconferencing, special events, and interactive learning. IT Policies and Procedure ensures that Information Technology services are identified, documented, communicated, and maintained.

Each year IT develops a Master Plan for the year that guides the activities in these nine areas. The Sinclair Strategic IT Planning Process is a proven approach to incorporating the technology-related needs of College departments into Sinclair’s overall Information Technology plan. The process is driven through ongoing collaboration meetings between each College department and the Sinclair IT department liaisons, working together to identify opportunities where technology can play a role in addressing college needs, formulating solutions for those needs, and incorporating those solutions into capital requests and the annual Sinclair IT Master Plan. To provide a sense of the scope of the plan, Figure 5.15 provides a list of the Tier 1 (top priority) projects for 2014-15 in the Master Plan. The IT division also seeks to complete an additional 53 lower priority Tier 2 projects beyond those listed in Figure 5.15.
Technology is used extensively in both the delivery of and support of educational instruction. The large majority of the College's classrooms are equipped with multimedia podiums, provide faculty access to the internet, PowerPoint, video capability, and other software programs to enhance learning. A large number of classrooms on campus also have PC computer stations for each student in the class.

In addition, each section at Sinclair is supported through an online course shell in the Learning Management System that enhances interaction between the faculty and the student. Course syllabi, announcements, content, and activities can all be shared via the shell for the section. Assignments and exams can be submitted, attendance can be recorded, and grades can be recorded and made available to students. Discussion group capability is enabled in all of these online course shells. As has been noted previously, Sinclair is switching to a new Learning Management System in Summer 2015, and it is anticipated that the same level of functionality will be available for each section Sinclair offers in the new system. Sinclair's Help Desk provides training and technical assistance to both students and faculty via the shell online and by phone. With the transition to the new LMS, extensive training will be provided to faculty and staff to familiarize them with the new system.

- **Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly**

The Office of Facilities Management oversees the physical infrastructure of the college. The mission of the Facilities Management Department is to sustain the College's overall appearance and to maintain the College's buildings, grounds, utilities, equipment, mechanical and electrical systems in a cost effective manner to provide an aesthetic, safe, healthy and comfortable environment for the College community. The attainment of this mission ensures that the teaching and community service activities of the College continue uninterrupted. In FY 2014 the College devoted almost 10% of the College's total operating budget to plant operations and maintenance, representing an investment of $12 million dollars.

The Department of Public Safety ensures the security and safety of the physical infrastructure. This department oversees the Sinclair Police Department, which includes 23 full-time and 1 part-time sworn professional police officers, all of whom have attended over 450 hours of training through the Ohio Peace Officer Training Academy and hold certification as police officers in the State of Ohio. All officers undergo continuing specialized training in firearms, first aid, CPR, defensive tactics, legal updates, and other law enforcement subjects to maintain their skills. The department also employs three full-time and seven part-time dispatchers, over 70 part-time Security Information Officers, and two student officers. The members of these latter units do not have statutory arrest powers, but work to assist with security matters. The department utilizes motorized patrol, bike patrol, and foot patrol of campus buildings, grounds, and parking facilities 24-hours a day, seven days a week, including holidays when the campus is closed.

The Sinclair Police Communications Center serves as a vital link between the college community and the Department of Public Safety in matters relating to public safety and emergency assistance. The Communications Center is staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week and is responsible for answering calls for police, fire and emergency medical assistance, calls for maintenance and escort services, monitoring fire, intrusion, emergency and maintenance alarms, dispatching, and also for coordinating police, fire and EMS units in emergency and non-emergency situations.

The Communications Center is linked via computer network to the Dayton Police Department and other local, state, and national law enforcement agencies. The Center operates a dynamic computer-based system which monitors and controls various life safety and protection systems throughout campus.

Sinclair highly encourages students, staff, and faculty to sign up for emergency text alerts, providing Campus Police the ability to inform stakeholders of emergency situations as soon as they arise.

- **Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness**

Risk management at Sinclair is accomplished through several safeguards:

**The Strategic Priorities.** Four strategic priorities provide the core of Sinclair’s strategies: Access and Affordability; Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support; Alignment to the Community; and Effective Sustainable Organization. These priorities ensure a healthy balance for risk assessment. For instance, an extraordinarily expensive innovation might increase student success yet compromise sustainability and affordability.

The College considers implications of its plans within this balanced framework to assess and address risk.

**Community, State, and National Engagement.**

Risk is also mitigated through ongoing environmental scanning and awareness of community, state, and national current - and anticipated - changes to the community college and/or higher education landscape. Sinclair’s leaders serve on a variety of community, state, and national Boards. This service ensures a broad understanding of low risk, high return possibilities for the College. In addition, Sinclair leadership interact regularly with state officials at the Ohio Board of Regents and state government, forging and maintaining strong relationships that help inform the institution regarding possible future risks.

**Sinclair’s General Legal Counsel.** The expert counsel of a full-time staff attorney allows...
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Sinclair to exercise caution in planning and operations, especially when they involve contract negotiations, human resources, safety risks, or other areas of potential liability.

Financial Planning. Through solid financial planning, the College develops, models, and validates various scenarios to assess risks. With inputs from senior leaders and consultants, in addition to the guidance of the Board of Trustees, the College drafts plans and seeks further advice as appropriate. The Board of Trustee’s Finance Committee has encouraged the President to “seek the advice of, and consult with, skilled people wherever located, to secure the best and most creative advice.” (Board Advance 2011).

Internal and External Reviews and Audits. The College is highly committed to the value of external audits to assess and minimize risk. The College posts its financial audits from the years 2007 through 2013 on the website for the Office of the President (see www.sinclair.edu/about/president/).

Emergency preparedness is given high priority at Sinclair. Information on emergency preparedness is available on the website for the Department of Public Safety (see www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/police/emergency/). Guidance is provided regarding

- Medical Emergencies (www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/police/emergency/FirstAidMedicalCare/)
- Tornado Preparedness (www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/police/emergency/TornadoInformation/)
- Earthquake Safety (www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/police/pub/earthquake.pdf)
- Locations of emergency intercoms across campus that are part of the Emergency Blue Light Network (www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/police/emergency/EmergencyBlueLightNetwork/)
- Incident Response Plans (www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/police/emergencyproceduresguidecondensedversion/).

Plans are included for:
- o Active Shooter
- o Bomb Threat
- o Civil Disturbance
- o Earthquake / Building Collapse
- o Evacuation
- o Hazardous Material Spill
- o Human Bodily Fluids
- o Lockdown Procedure
- o Medical Emergency
- o Power Outage
- o Suspicious Packages
- o Tornado / Severe Weather

In addition, safety instructions for individuals with disabilities are available on Sinclair’s website at www.sinclair.edu/support/disability/pub/safetyinformation.pdf.

What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future?

- Outcomes/measures tracked and tools utilized
- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

The Sinclair IT Master Plan provides a number of accomplishments from the previous year that provide evidence of effective management of operations in that area. Figure 5.16 lists prior year highlights from the FY 2013-14 IT Master Plan. As can be seen, IT had either completed or near completion of 86 Master Plan projects by the end of the year, in addition to the completion of 20 additional projects that were not part of the original master plan.

Figure 5.17 provides the average uptime for the period of 2009 through 2013 for major electronic systems at Sinclair, including the Colleague student database system, e-mail, on-line services and others. As can be seen, in each area uptime was never less than 99.7%.

Figure 5.18 compares Sinclair systems uptime for the past several years against industry benchmarks, based on data provided by Gartner, an IT research and advisory company. According to these data, Sinclair is generally close to or above “best in class” in terms of systems availability.

Figure 5.19 provides comparisons based on Gartner data for resolution of Help Desk Requests. Sinclair has maintained a rate similar to that of industry benchmarks, although the percent of requests resolved upon initial contact has declined in recent years.
After peaking in FY 2012, the number of Help Desk Support requests has decreased in recent years, as can be seen in Figure 5.20. Figure 5.21 provides some operational highlights from the FY 2014 IT Master Plan. These numbers provide a good overall picture of the scope of the work that is completed by the IT Division.

Some data regarding the adequacy of the physical infrastructure and the perception of safety on campus are available from student feedback. As Figure 5.22 demonstrates, across several administrations of the Current Student Survey between 83% - 88% of student respondents have indicated that they feel safe on campus. Between 83% and 85% agreed that “finding my way around campus is easy.”
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FIGURE 5.22
CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE OF</th>
<th>RATINGS ON</th>
<th>FALL 2008</th>
<th>FALL 2010</th>
<th>FALL 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>I feel safe on campus</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Finding my way around the campus is easy</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5.23
CURRENT YEAR GOALS AND PRIORITIES FROM THE IT MASTER PLAN FOR FY 2014-15

Current Year Goals and Priorities

- **Usability**
  - Making Systems Easier to Use with Improved Functionality
  - 58%
  - 26 Tier 1 Projects
  - 27 Tier 2 Projects

- **Availability**
  - Improving the Reliability of the Systems
  - 37%
  - 19 Tier 1 Projects
  - 17 Tier 2 Projects

- **Manageability**
  - Lowering the Costs and Efforts to Manage Our Systems
  - 52%
  - 28 Tier 1 Projects
  - 22 Tier 2 Projects

- **Supportability**
  - Increasing Our Ability to Provide the Best Support Possible
  - 53%
  - 24 Tier 1 Projects
  - 27 Tier 2 Projects

- **Usability**
  - Making Systems Easier to Use with Improved Functionality
  - 58%
  - 26 Tier 1 Projects
  - 27 Tier 2 Projects

Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems Availability</td>
<td>99.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Help Desk Calls Resolved at Time of Call</td>
<td>Higher is Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Help Desk Calls Abandoned by Caller</td>
<td>Lower is better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Master Plan Projects</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5I3 Based on 5R3, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Figure 5.23 provides current year goals and priorities according to the IT Master Plan for FY 2014-15. As can be seen, 58% of Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects identified for FY 2014-15 will help make systems easier to use with improved functionality, while 37% of projects help improve the reliability of systems. The IT Division has set goals for 100% completion of all Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects, resolution of 80% of Help Desk calls at the time of the call, and 99.97% systems availability.

In addition, in the coming year IT will be bringing the following new systems to full operational status:

- Learning Management System, Desire2Learn, which will replace the Angel system.
- Customer Relationship Management System, Hobson’s, which will provide improved abilities to communicate and track students and other constituents.
- Document Management System, ImageNow, which will allow improvements in the processing of documents throughout the college, with the initial implementation taking place in Financial Aid.

Sinclair is currently in the midst of development of a new Health Sciences Strategy, which will include the renovation of an existing building into a dedicated Health Sciences building. Figure 5.24 lists the factors driving the development of this new Health Sciences Strategy. Planning is currently underway for renovations that will help accomplish the goals associated with the strategy, but the plans will not be finalized until later in 2015. If approved, the new Health Sciences building will represent the greatest change to Sinclair’s physical infrastructure in the past decade.

FIGURE 5.24
FACTORS DRIVING DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW HEALTH SCIENCES STRATEGY

- **The Future Healthcare Workforce and Education**
  - Increased healthcare demand and the shift to coordinated care will affect numbers of needed workers and the skills they must have.
  - 1. Shortages are expected in virtually all areas of healthcare.
  - 2. Greater demand for Non-clinical, Healthcare Supporting Professionals
  - 3. Inter-professional Collaboration Requires a New type of Purposeful Education
  - 4. State-of-the-art Simulation needed for effective Inter-personal Team Education
  - 5. Practice/Academic Partnerships needed to Bridge Practice Gaps, Create Efficiencies
SINCLAIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE | MAY 2015

AQIP CATEGORY SIX: QUALITY OVERVIEW

CATEGORY INTRODUCTION
Sinclair’s four Strategic Priorities guide all Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives:

- Student Learning and Support
- Effective and Sustainable Organization
- Access and Affordability
- Community Alignment

The Office of the President and President’s Cabinet select CQIs based on alignment with these strategic priorities. Once selected and approved by these senior college leaders, the Vice Presidents implement these initiatives in their respective areas. These CQI initiatives may be in response to developments external to Sinclair, but often result from an internal recognition of possibilities for improving procedures and processes. Frequently they form the basis for the AQIP Action Projects. Members of President’s Cabinet oversee all AQIP Action Projects. The President’s Cabinet weekly meetings provide a forum for discussing progress on these initiatives and for evaluating their impact.

Sinclair’s commitment to the four Strategic Priorities helps assure alignment between the Systems Portfolios, Action Projects, Quality Check-Up, and Strategy Forums, because Sinclair’s work in each of these areas is guided by the Strategic Priorities. Sinclair aligned all former and current AQIP Action Projects with one or more of these priorities; and, in fact, all of Sinclair’s AQIP work is heavily influenced by them. Over the next few years they will continue to exert a heavy influence on the College’s AQIP Action Projects and various completion initiatives.

Continuous Quality Improvement comes naturally to Sinclair, given the well-established culture of quality and innovation that exists at the institution. Sinclair takes great pride in its commitment to high quality, which is explicitly stated in both its mission and vision statements. It is the commitment to quality improvement that led Sinclair to become an early adopter of the AQIP pathway for accreditation. Continuous improvement has been incorporated into the college’s evaluation processes for both faculty and non-faculty employees. The concept of CQI is spread campus-wide both by college-wide communication (such as through the institution’s AQIP website) and by the inclusion of employees from a variety of areas on campus in CQI initiatives, particularly the AQIP Action Projects. Moreover, CQI has been built into the Program Review and Annual Update processes, helping academic departments understand and embrace the principles of continuous improvement.

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF PROCESSES FOR CATEGORY 6: INTEGRATED

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF RESULTS FOR CATEGORY 6: INTEGRATED

CATEGORY RESPONSES

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES

6P1 Quality Improvement Initiatives focus on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution. Describe the processes for determining, and integrating CQI initiatives, and who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Selecting, deploying, and evaluating quality improvement initiatives

The four Strategic Priorities guide quality improvement initiatives at Sinclair: Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support, Effective and Sustainable Organization, Access and Affordability, and Community Alignment. Sinclair selects CQI initiatives based on how well they align with one or more of these Strategic Priorities. Sinclair’s President, in collaboration with President’s Cabinet, generally selects and guides CQI initiatives. Figure 6.1 displays the membership of President’s Cabinet as of May 2015 (see www.sinclair.edu/about/president/cabinet/ for the current membership of President’s Cabinet).

FIGURE 6.1
MEMBERSHIP OF SINCLAIR’S PRESIDENT’S CABINET (APRIL 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steven Lee Johnson</td>
<td>President and CEO, Sinclair College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Bailey</td>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Boudouris</td>
<td>Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Carter</td>
<td>Senior Advisor to the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annesa Cheek</td>
<td>Vice President for School and Community Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Cleary</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Student Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Collins</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Cruz</td>
<td>Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gaier</td>
<td>Vice President for Organizational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Iseli</td>
<td>Vice President for Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Markland</td>
<td>Vice President for Regional Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Norris</td>
<td>Vice President for Workforce Development &amp; Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty Stone</td>
<td>Vice President for Business Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Zakel</td>
<td>Associate Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President’s Cabinet manages the annual planning process, facilitates internal and external stakeholder involvement, provides a forum for budget decisions to ensure resources are appropriately allocated to support institutional priorities, provides ongoing monitoring of activities related to the strategic priorities, and provides ongoing monitoring of institutional progress (Key Performance Indicators). President’s Cabinet members approve and supervise major CQI initiatives. Given the cross-functional composition of this group, this helps ensure that CQI initiatives are properly coordinated and communicated widely across the institution.

At times CQI initiatives are intrinsically motivated, and spring from internally recognized opportunities for improvement. An excellent example of this is one of the current AQIP Action Projects, “Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion.” Sinclair’s course scheduling processes have remained the same for many, many years, and numerous stakeholders had identified this as an opportunity for improvement, particularly in using data when building the schedule and monitoring enrollment throughout the enrollment cycle to better manage average class size. The College developed enrollment targets, and collaborative planning between the Budget Office and department chairpersons determined the number of sections required. However, when the time came to build a schedule for a term, disconnects occurred between the College planning process and course scheduling process. The Optimizing Course Scheduling AQIP Action Project seeks to bridge this gap. The Provost and Associate Provost brought the initiative to President’s Cabinet for consideration; after a thoughtful discussion, that group determined to make it an AQIP Action Project. This is an example of a project where a recognition of the opportunity for an internal process improvement provided the impetus for the project, and where members of President’s Cabinet brought the issue to the overall group for consideration.

On other occasions, external events may inspire CQI initiatives. In recent years, increasing student completion rates has emerged as the top priority in higher education, and this emphasis has created a need for institutions nationwide to address how completion could be increased. Community colleges in particular have been under the microscope as their comparatively lower completion rates have been highlighted and discussed in the media. This has created a pressing need for all institutions to demonstrate that they are making progress in increasing the number of students who successfully complete academic programs and earn a credential.

Sinclair’s response to this need came early, and represents one of the largest initiatives the institution has ever undertaken. A collection of grant-funded initiatives including Completion by Design, Connect 4 Completion, and others have all been consolidated under the coordination of the Associate Provost for Student Completion. This new grant funded position, created several years ago, coordinates the various completion efforts, to increase efficiencies in these efforts and reduce duplication. A current AQIP Action Project, “Building a Holistic Advising System,” is one major component of these completion initiatives, seeking to identify and implement an holistic advising system to address students’ academic, personal, career, and financial needs. This is an example of a CQI initiative that was extrinsically motivated, although it dovetails with much of Sinclair’s existing work in the area.

Regardless of whether a CQI initiative is motivated by external pressures or through internal process improvement recognition, in both cases President’s Cabinet determines how the opportunity will be addressed and oversees its implementation. President’s Cabinet oversees all current AQIP Action Projects.

Once a course of action has been set by President’s Cabinet, it is up to the appropriate vice president to ensure implementation of the initiative in his or her area, relying on the directors or deans who report to them. Weekly President’s Cabinet meetings provide ample opportunity to discuss progress on the CQI initiative, and from time to time, the Council receives official progress report presentations.

President’s Cabinet also evaluates the impact of the CQI initiatives, frequently calling upon RAR to perform and analysis and report results. Unfortunately, often these initiatives involve processes where improvements may not be see in outcome measures for many years. Any effort at increasing completion rates, for example, takes time for current students to receive benefits throughout their programs. Consequently increases may not be fully realized for a number of years after implementation. In some cases, results can be seen more quickly. During the 2006-07, internal discussions commenced regarding the then-current practice of requiring students to apply for graduation rather than simply awarding them the earned credential(s). President’s Cabinet decided to eliminate the graduation application requirement. The College experienced an immediate increase in the number of credentials awarded at the end of that academic year, as can be seen in Figure 6.2. Note the dramatic increase in completions from FY 2006-07 to FY 2007-08, particularly for certificates and short-term certificates, where in many cases students did not apply to be awarded the credential because they sought an associate degree. This internally generated CQI initiative, overseen by President’s Cabinet, had an immediate impact on student success with quick analysis and documentable results.
• Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Quality Check-Up, and Strategy Forums

Sinclair first joined AQIP more than a decade ago, and in that time has participated in two Strategy Forums, completed two Systems Portfolios prior to this one, and completed eight AQIP Action Projects in addition to the current three. Aligning all of these activities comes easily to Sinclair, given its laser focus on the four Strategic Priorities of Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support, Effective and Sustainable Organization, Access and Affordability, and Community Alignment. These four priorities guided the discussions at both Strategy Forums, which in turn guided the selection of the AQIP Action Projects that Sinclair has developed since joining AQIP. As can be seen in the previous sections of this document, these Strategic Priorities also support the discussions found throughout the Systems Portfolio. Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Quality Checkup, and Strategy Forms comes very naturally to Sinclair, because overarching and undergirding all of them is a commitment to the four Strategic Priorities that guide the institution in fulfilling its mission.

Figure 6.3 displays Sinclair’s completed and current AQIP Action Projects and aligns them to the relevant Strategic Priority. Figure 6.4 displays the outcomes for the AQIP Action Projects that were completed most recently.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION PROJECT</th>
<th>INITIAL GOAL</th>
<th>SUCCESSFUL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Student Services</td>
<td>The current student support services model no longer meets the needs of Sinclair students and does not support the college's strategies to expand online learning and support access and services. The goal of this project is to define and implement a new web-centric student services model that will be more efficient and fit better with our students' lifestyles. This is a phased project that will include an intermediate step to ensure that services are available to online students, effective fall 2007.</td>
<td>Online Student Services has been incorporated into the College's continuous improvement efforts. Participated in and played leadership role in the statewide CENTSS audit project. Joined the statewide eTutoring consortium to provide online tutoring. Increased college awareness of the need for online services through presentations, surveys, forums and strategy meetings. Assisted several departments with extending services to online students. Developed roadmap to take services from current to desired state. Influenced the redesign of the navigation for the Sinclair website and portal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Success</td>
<td>Student success in writing courses in college English and developmental English has drawn much attention across the United States. Sinclair is no exception. Sinclair writing faculty in both Developmental Studies and English have worked individually for many years with a goal of improving student success in writing. This project will foster collaborative efforts between both departments and enlist broader institutional support to expand the search for new or refined teaching methods and other opportunities to improve writing success and retention for our students.</td>
<td>Alignment of the curriculum between the Academic Foundations and English departments. Creation of and adherence to common course outcomes. Creation of a common course (teaching) syllabus for English Composition I. Use of common textbooks. Improved communication and collaboration among faculty of the two departments with the goal of improving student learning and success. Implementation of the Accelerated ENG/ACC 297 course pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Retention and Success</td>
<td>The goal of this project is to: Identify factors that impact student success and retention in select Sinclair developmental math and math courses (DEV 084, DEV 085, DEV 108, and MAT 101). Target select factors and define intervention strategies to improve student success. Implement intervention strategies. Assess the impact of new strategies on student success. Operationalize successful intervention strategies.</td>
<td>The Academic Foundations and Math departments have built a culture of tracking student success and using data to make decisions toward continuous improvement. The Academic Foundations and Math departments are collaborating more in an effort to increase student completion. The Academic Foundations and Math departments are now using the software, MyMathLab, because of its user friendliness for both students and faculty. This provides students a more seamless transition from one department to the other. Students are experiencing hands-on learning in the classroom and are actively working on problems and on task. Students are able to receive more one-on-one time with their instructors. Faculty are using common materials, including textbooks, homework assignments, and assessments. Students are commenting that they enjoy supportive faculty and tutors in the Math Academy. Furthermore, instructors meet regularly to discuss the curriculum, students, and best practices. Faculty members have created minimum scores on assessments in both departments in order for students to move successfully through the material. Video lessons have been added to Math Academy courses to create another opportunity for students to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the First Year Student Experience</td>
<td>National studies have shown that the first year and particularly the first weeks of the first year are critical to students completing their educational goals. In the past, discussion surrounding student success at Sinclair has tended to focus more on student deficits and less on the systems that influence success. Through this action project, we will study related but often disconnected college systems and programs that have direct effects on the success of entering students and improve and integrate current resources and practices in order to increase new student engagement and support services for entering students.</td>
<td>Use of the MAP tool to help students navigate their way to completion has revolutionized the way we advise our students. Over 500 full- and part-time faculty have participated in completion activities and professional development, much of which focuses on getting students off to a good start in their first year. In part due to the institution's work with the first-year experience, the completion agenda has become part of the institutional culture. A new checklist was developed by the AQIP First-Year Experience Action Team of activities that new students should complete. An increase in the percent of new student participation in orientation from 51% to 68% has been attributed to this change. The Light Touch program was implemented - first time in college students were assigned to participating faculty and staff who make contact with the student several times in the weeks leading up to and following their first day of college classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance Evaluation System</td>
<td>The goal of this project is to design a new on-line performance evaluation system that will promote consistency and simplicity for evaluators and those employees being evaluated. The system will consist of components that measure actual job performance, outcomes, and performance development and professional growth.</td>
<td>The new eAppraisal system allows for capturing narratives, comments and documentation throughout the year, which users appreciate. The interface is user-friendly and intuitive, which has been important in establishing its use among employees at the College. Input from the employee, the first level supervisor, and the second level supervisor are all brought together to inform employee performance evaluation. The cross-functional committee that oversaw this AQIP Action Project allowed for input from various groups on campus, and helped ensure that their viewpoints and feedback were incorporated into the process. The eAppraisal has become connected to annual compensation actions in a transparent way that allows employees to see how performance evaluations are tied to pay increases. Overall, the eAppraisal process represents a considerable improvement over the performance evaluation processes that the institution used previously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives?

In addition to the AQIP Action Projects that Sinclair has completed in recent years, the various completion initiatives, overseen by the Associate Provost for Student Completion, have also begun yielding results. Work on these initiatives is ongoing: Completion by Design, Connect 4 Completion, City Connects, Accelerate IT, and the other initiatives focus on increasing student completion targeting four phases in the educational career of students:

- Connect: From Interest to Application
- Entry: From Application to Completion of Gatekeeper Classes
- Progress: From 25% to 75% through Curriculum
- Complete: From 75% through Curriculum to Career or Transfer

**Figure 6.5** displays some of the most recent results from these initiatives relating to the Connect Phase. Substantial progress has been made in this phase in terms of streamlining developmental education for students and helping them achieve college-level readiness more quickly.

**Figure 6.6** displays some of the available results for the Entry Phase. Encouraging signs can be seen in the data that have been collected for accelerated courses, indicating that they appear to move students through their developmental and gatekeeper courses more quickly without compromising student success.

The Math Academy demonstrated substantial gains in developmental math relative to students in regular developmental math sections. Quantway™ holds considerable promise as an alternative, and more highly successful, pathway for Liberal Arts majors in math courses that highlight quantitative reasoning.

### Connect Phase: From Interest to Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS SERVED</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resource Centers</td>
<td>Fall 2007 - Spring 2012</td>
<td>4,543</td>
<td>Eliminated 5,726 credit hours of Developmental Education; saved about $219,293 in tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Camps for Math</td>
<td>Summer 2010 - Spring 2013</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>79% eliminated one level of Developmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Camps for Reading</td>
<td>Winter 2011 - Spring 2013</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>91% eliminated one level of Developmental Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Camps for Writing</td>
<td>Winter 2011 - Spring 2013</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>82% eliminated one level of Developmental English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Resource Centers</td>
<td>Fall 2008 - Spring 2013</td>
<td>4,793</td>
<td>Eliminated 6150 credit hours of Developmental Education; saved about $235,531 in tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages - The WebCAPE Assessment Test</td>
<td>September 2008 - present</td>
<td>250+ per year at local high schools in Montgomery &amp; Warren counties</td>
<td>Over 70% of high school students taking the test receive credit for at least one term of Spanish, French or German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>30% higher retention rate for students who attended new student orientation than those who did not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entry Phase: From Application to Completion of Gatekeeper Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS SERVED</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated English</td>
<td>Fall 2010 - Fall 2013</td>
<td>379 (students who tested just below college level)</td>
<td>69.3% successfully completed their college-level English compared to 70% who tested into college-level English and successfully completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Intro to Algebra I &amp; II</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78% of the students completed the combined course successfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 114/141 Student Success Initiative</td>
<td>2009 - Current</td>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>10% increase in student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Touch Delegate Program</td>
<td>Fall 2011 - Spring 2014</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>Fall 2011 cohort: 22% Fall to Winter retention improvement over matched control group; Fall 2012 cohort: 9% Fall to Winter retention improvement over matched control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Academy</td>
<td>Fall 2010 - Spring 2013</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>Success rates are 10-12% points higher than traditional Developmental Math classes; 104 students completed two or more Developmental Math classes in one term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Academic Plans (MAPs)</td>
<td>Winter 2011 - present</td>
<td>36,407</td>
<td>85% of students who successfully complete their first term are closely following their MAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy Assistant Competitive Admissions</td>
<td>Fall 2013 - present</td>
<td>All eligible students</td>
<td>Average attrition fell rate fell from 16% to zero Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Learning Assessment</td>
<td>Fall 1995 - Spring 2010</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>6,888 students received some form of Prior Learning Assessment credit; of those, 2,576 students (37%) completed degrees and/or certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantway™</td>
<td>Winter 2012 - present</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>64% bridged gap from DEV Math to transferable Math compared to 25% over two semesters in former pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Care Competitive Admissions</td>
<td>Fall of 2013-present</td>
<td>All eligible students in program</td>
<td>Average attrition rate fell from 41% Fall 2013 to 18% Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Connect Phase**

**ENTRY PHASE**

**Figure 6.5** CURRENTLY AVAILABLE CONNECT PHASE RESULTS

**Figure 6.6** CURRENTLY AVAILABLE ENTRY PHASE RESULTS

---

**SINCLAIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE | MAY 2015**
In the Progress Phase, students have moved at least part of the way through their programs. Figure 6.7 displays available results for students in initiatives that target this phase. The Individual Learning Plan (ILP) program more than doubled graduation rates for participating at-risk students relative to their peers, as has the Urban African-American Mentoring Program.

Finally, the College also has some results for the Complete Phase. Figure 6.8 demonstrates that the Credit When It is Due program has resulted in 9 additional credentials through reverse transfer, while Ohio Means Internships already has some encouraging data regarding its student participants on track to graduate.

Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? CQI improvement work at Sinclair over the next three years will primarily focus in two areas:

- AQIP Action Projects
- Various completion initiatives

Figure 6.9 provides information on Sinclair’s current AQIP Action Items.
In addition, the various completion initiatives (described in greater detail in section 1P5) will be the focus of the CQI work the college does in the next several years. Two of the AQIP Action Projects listed in Figure 6.9 are in fact outgrowths of these completion initiatives. Given the substantial resources that Sinclair has invested in these initiatives and the careful thought and planning that has gone into them, it is anticipated that there will be significant results from these initiatives to report in the next Systems Portfolio.

**CULTURE OF QUALITY**

Culture of Quality focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for:

- Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality
- Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations (5.D.1)
- Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives (5.D.2)
- Reviewing, reaffirming, and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

Sinclair’s mission statement underscores the emphasis that the institution places on quality:

“We help individuals turn dreams into achievable goals through accessible, high quality, affordable learning opportunities.”

One of Sinclair’s Strategic Priorities highlights our commitment to quality:

**Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support**

Quality is at the heart of everything Sinclair does. At Sinclair, quality means something. It is a source of pride. It sets a standard for performance that isn’t open to compromise. Quality is part of who we are; it is a key element of how we see ourselves as an institution. The expectation of quality is embedded in our identity. As the Sinclair vision statement so aptly puts it:

- Before us lie uncharted worlds of opportunity.
  Sinclair will be the bridge into that future, giving open access to opportunity, intellectual challenge and self-discovery for students with diverse needs.
- With Sinclair, people will pursue their quests for lifelong learning through affordable, high quality education.
- At Sinclair, people will benefit from a caring approach to teaching and learning that provides personal attention and encourages individual growth.

- Through Sinclair, people will be empowered with knowledge and skills for their journeys.
- Our success shall hinge on turning these values into action: dedication to quality and excellence; reliance on anticipation, imagination and innovation; commitment to responsible citizenship within our community; adherence to the Sinclair credo — “find the need and endeavor to meet it”; confidence in the courage, determination and diversity of our students, employees, and supporters; and belief in unlimited human potential.

Sinclair’s culture has embraced the tenets of continuous process improvement since the early 1990s. The infrastructure of the college’s policies and processes, including the student success-focused strategic priorities and KPIs linked to employee compensation, is constructed so as to aid in the selection of targeted improvements. Additionally, the college’s growing capacity for data analysis helps surface opportunities for initiatives that will enhance the college’s effectiveness and efficiency in serving students. The faculty use a review process as an assessment mechanism to determine strengths and weaknesses and to develop targets for continuous improvement. Non-faculty personnel use the eAppraisal process to align their activities with the strategic priorities and to identify strengths and opportunities for growth or improvement which are translated into continuous improvement targets. Thus, for both faculty and non-faculty employees, Continuous Improvement Targets (CITs) are an integral part of the employee evaluation and compensation structure at the college, and further establish the strong commitment to quality and continuous improvement in the minds of all college employees. The embedded nature of continuous improvement in Sinclair’s processes reflects an integrated system that supports an institutional culture of quality.

This commitment to quality is why Sinclair was one of the early adopters of the AQIP Pathway, the pathway that most explicitly underscores the importance of continuous improvement. It is why Sinclair pursued and received the prestigious Completion by Design grant; it is why the College pursued the $12 million Department of Labor grant that led to the creation of Accelerate IT; and it is why we are a member of the League for Innovation and recognized as a League Vanguard Learning College. Our commitment to quality motivates us to boldly move forward in finding new ways to help our students succeed. It also inspires us to work harder to help more of our students succeed, because among the hallmarks of a truly high quality institution of higher education is that it will never rest on its laurels, it will never be content with the status quo, and it will never be satisfied with second best. At Sinclair our passion for quality drives us to be the best we can, and it is this restless pursuit of continuous improvement in serving our students and the surrounding community that motivates us.
Figure 6.10 is a screenshot from the AQIP page on Sinclair’s website (see www.sinclair.edu/about/aqip/), and does an excellent job of illustrating Sinclair’s commitment to quality and how that led to our involvement in AQIP. It also underscores why quality and reaccreditation are so important to Sinclair – because it is all about “helping students learn.”

Part of the way that Sinclair ensures that CQI makes an evident and widely understood impact and that the entire campus is engaged in AQIP is by including a variety of stakeholders from disparate departments on campus on the AQIP Action Teams. This diversity in team members not only allows for different viewpoints as the teams undertake their work, but also helps seed the continuous philosophy behind AQIP across the campus (addresses Core component 5.D.1).

Figure 6.11 displays the team members for the current AQIP Action Teams, and helps underscore the cross-functional composition of these teams. Note that the Institutional Policy Review project has also involved numerous external stakeholders, including state officials, higher education organization officials, and members from the four institutions in the Ohio Completion by Design Cadre.

The culture of continuous improvement is further reinforced to academic departments through the Program Review and Annual Update processes. Both the five-year Program Review self-study template and the Annual Update require departments to respond to the following questions involving the use of data from assessment of General Education and program outcomes:

- Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of general education outcomes? If so, what are those changes?
- How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?
- Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes?
- How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?

These questions reinforce the concept that assessment at Sinclair is not just about checking a box, but about using data to continuously improve student learning experiences. The concept of continuous improvement is further reinforced by a question on the Program Review self-study template regarding the process used in completing the self-study and how it could be improved: “Briefly describe the process that the department followed to examine its status and prepare for this review. What were the strengths of the process, and what would the department do differently in its next five-year review?” (addresses Core component 5.D.2).
AQIP, and the spirit of continuous quality improvement that is embodies, aligns well with the historic institutional culture of Sinclair. Sinclair designs its processes with continuous improvement in mind, AQIP Action Teams involve team members from all across campus working on CQI initiatives, and continuous improvement is integral to employee evaluation and compensation. In so many ways AQIP and the principles of continuous quality improvement have become inextricably incorporated into the day-to-day activities of Sinclair, woven seamlessly into the fabric of the institution’s campus culture.

What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality?

An important indication that a culture of quality exists at Sinclair can be found on an item from the most recent administration of the PACE Climate Survey. This was a customized question included for the first time on the 2013 administration, and asked college employees to rate on a 7-point scale “the extent to which the people I work with most closely are committed to producing top quality work.” Figure 6.12 demonstrates exceptionally high ratings: the overall mean rating was 6.21 on a scale from 1 (least agreement) to 7 (most agreement), and of the four categories of employees the lowest mean rating was still 6.15. This sends a powerful message that across the college respondents overwhelmingly agreed that those with whom they work share a commitment to producing top quality work at Sinclair.

PACE respondents also expressed their confidence that Sinclair uses feedback for improvements with ratings for “the extent to which Sinclair will use this survey to make improvements,” as can be seen in Figure 6.13.

As the two previous figures demonstrate, there is an internal perception that Sinclair maintains a culture of quality. There are also indications that this is the external perception in the local community as well. Further evidence for the culture of quality at Sinclair comes from the January 2014 Community Leader Survey. Figure 6.14 demonstrates that leaders in the Dayton community see Sinclair as embodying quality. External validation of the culture of quality at Sinclair also comes from the Annual Community Poll, where 88% of respondents indicated that Sinclair offers a high quality of education at an affordable price, and 76% rated Sinclair’s overall quality of education as good or excellent. Figure 6.15 displays these results.

Benchmark comparisons with other Ohio institutions also provide evidence of quality. Sinclair enrolls roughly 10% of Ohio’s for-credit community college students, yet produces 17% of degree and certificate completers. From FY 2008 through FY 2012, Sinclair awarded more degrees and certificates than any other Ohio community college. In that period, Sinclair produced more degree and certificates than the bottom 10 community college combined. Figure 6.16 provides additional detail.
Sinclair manages to produce the most degrees and certificates of any community college in the State of Ohio, while maintaining the lowest per student on Instruction, Academic Support, and Student Support and less on Administration and Facilities relative to the average, as Figure 6.17 demonstrates.

Taken together, Figure 6.16 and Figure 6.17 tell a very important story about quality at Sinclair: that Sinclair awards degrees and certificates to more students than any other community college in the State, while spending more in areas that directly impact students and less on administration, institutional overhead, and facilities.

In summary, both internal and external evidence support the perception that Sinclair possesses a culture of quality, and has thereby earned the respect of its students, employees, and the community at large.

**FIGURE 6.16**
NUMBER OF DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES AWARDED BY OHIO COMMUNITY COLLEGES

**FIGURE 6.17**
SINCLAIR SPENDING PER FTE STUDENT COMARED TO THE OHIO AVERAGE

**SINCLAIR AWAITS MORE DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES THAN ANY OTHER OHIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

Five-Year Totals (FY08-FY12) (Source: Ohio Board of Regents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Degrees/Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair</td>
<td>19,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>11,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens</td>
<td>8,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati State</td>
<td>7,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County</td>
<td>6,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark State College</td>
<td>5,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland</td>
<td>5,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>4,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes State</td>
<td>3,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ohio</td>
<td>2,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern State</td>
<td>2,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>2,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>2,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark State</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest State</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>2,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>1,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra State</td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Gateway</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sinclair enrolls about 10% of Ohio’s community college (college credit) students, yet produces 17% of Ohio’s degree and certificate completers (#1 in Ohio). State data show that Sinclair produces more than the bottom 10 colleges combined.

**SINCLAIR SPENDING PER FTE STUDENT**
Amount above and below the Ohio average spending rate per FTE student by operating budget spending category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC SUPPORT</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SUPPORT</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State of Ohio HEI Data for FY 13
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6I2 Based on 6R2, what improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

While high quality has long been a tradition at Sinclair, and while the institution has much to be proud of, previous sections of this Systems Portfolio have noted areas where the College plans improvements, all of which will have a significant impact on the level of quality at Sinclair:

* **Section 111/112**: While the institution has a robust, well-established structure for assessment of general education outcomes and program outcomes, with the transition to a new Learning Management Systems tools will be available to allow for more direct measure of these outcomes. Much of the initial work that will provide the foundation for these improvements is underway, but much work remains to be completed, and it is likely that the new processes for direct assessment of outcomes will not be well-established for several years.

* **Section 113**: The Program Review process is pivotal to maintaining high quality in academic department program offerings. Changes to the Program Review self-study template were initiated in the FY 2014-15 academic year, and monitoring the impact of these changes on the process will be important. In addition, two AQIP Action Projects, “Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion” and “Building a Holistic Advising System” target improving the way that Sinclair meets the needs of its students through more efficient course scheduling and more comprehensive academic advising.

* **Section 114/115**: The various completion initiatives, described in detail throughout this Systems Portfolio, will be the focus of improvement efforts for Academic Program quality in the coming years. Continuing work with Completion by Design, further implementation of Connect 4 Completion initiatives, and continuing implementation of the Accelerate IT Program will be the priority for improving quality in the areas of academic program quality and academic student support.

* **Section 116**: While policies regarding academic integrity are well-established, greater education of faculty in this area is needed, particularly surrounding the rights and responsibilities associated with academic freedom.

* **Section 211**: The “Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion” AQIP Action Project is ongoing, and is designed to allow Sinclair to better match availability of courses to student needs.
• **Section 212/213214/215**: Due to Performance Based Funding and the various grant-funded initiatives that Sinclair has undertaken, student retention, persistence, and completion are receiving an even greater focus of quality improvement efforts at Sinclair. Continuing work with Completion by Design and Connect 4 Completion will be a focus for improving quality over the next few several years.

• **Section 311/312**: While the current Faculty Performance Review process is relatively new and will need time before it can be properly assessed and evaluated, it will soon transition from the current paper-based process to an online process, which should make it more efficient and user-friendly for both faculty who are submitting and deans and chairpersons who review the submissions.

• **Section 313**: Important work in establishing Sinclair’s superb Center for Teaching and Learning was performed by the first CTL Director. The focus of improvement in the coming year will be managing a smooth transition between the current director and the new director.

• **Section 411**: Sinclair’s Strategic Priorities will be reviewed in the years prior to the next Systems Portfolio, and may be revised as appropriate.

• **Section 412**: Much of the strategic planning in the next three years will be geared toward improving the metrics associated with Performance Based Funding. As has been mentioned many times in this Systems Portfolio, improving student outcomes attainment will be a top priority at Sinclair for many years to come.

• **Section 413**: The various completion initiatives at Sinclair have provided an unprecedented number of opportunities for employees at Sinclair to develop leadership skills and move into positions of greater responsibility. These opportunities should continue for the next several years, offering a rare chance for expanding skills and scope of influence for a number of employees at Sinclair.

• **Section 414**: Sinclair is currently in the middle of a major overhaul of its website. While it will not be complete for a couple of years, in the future information on the college’s website should be more accessible for employees, students, and the general public.

• **Section 511/512**: The DAWN Portal has substantially expanded the access to and use of data at Sinclair. A new reporting mechanism, SAS Visual Analytics, promises even greater increases in access and utility of data. Reliance on these reports will likely increase, as the Performance Based Funding Dashboard is leveraged to provide data that are used to influence Sinclair’s share of state subsidy.

• **Section 513**: Transition to the new Learning Management System will consume much of Instructional Technologies’ attention and resources in the coming year. IT will continue to attempt around 90 projects a year, with roughly half of them prioritized as Tier 1 projects.

• **Section 611**: As in so many other areas, the various completion initiatives will provide the bulk of the Continuous Quality Improvement work that will occur at Sinclair over the next couple of years. In addition, the three AQIP Action Projects will be prioritized as continuous improvement efforts.

It is anticipated that in the next Systems Portfolio Sinclair will be able to report progress on each of these improvement efforts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOSSARY</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuplacer</td>
<td>Testing software for placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Average class size; an indicator of efficiency monitored by department chairpersons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGEL</td>
<td>Web-based learning management platform, available for distance learning delivery, course enhancements, course email, message boards, and other functions, used prior to Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Academic Resource Center; high school outreach program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4C</td>
<td>Connect 4 Completion; a Department of Education funded initiative that seeks to support students using Career Communities and Holistic Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CbD</td>
<td>Completion by Design; a Bill &amp; Melinda Gates grant funded initiative that seeks to increase success and completion of college students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCFSE</td>
<td>Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement; used to study comparative findings between student (CCSSE) and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSE</td>
<td>Community College Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement Target; set College-wide through Strategic Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMT</td>
<td>&quot;Curriculum Management Tool; curriculum approval and tracking mechanism for the College&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>Enterprise (ERP) software by Datatel; feeds data to warehouse for retrieval and reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA’s</td>
<td>Critical Performance Areas; 6 learning-related areas in job performance; part of the FPR process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAWN</td>
<td>Data Analysis Warehouse and iNtelligence; multi-purpose instructional data online reporting tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI</td>
<td>Developmental Education Initiative; a Bill &amp; Melinda Gates grant funded initiative that seeks to leverage developmental education innovations to increase student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire2Learn/eLearn</td>
<td>Web-based learning management platform, available for distance learning delivery, course enhancements, course email, message boards, and other functions, used beginning in Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>Prefix for Developmental courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td>Englewood Learning Center; regional satellite location offering courses and student support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Enterprise-Planning-Resource system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPR</td>
<td>Faculty Performance Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>Graduation Rate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>“Higher Education Information; the State of Ohio’s database for public community college and university information capture, tracking, and dissemination (see <a href="http://regents.ohio.gov/hei/index.php)%E2%80%9D">http://regents.ohio.gov/hei/index.php)”</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHLC</td>
<td>Huber Heights Learning Center; regional satellite location offering courses and student support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System <a href="http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/">http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>My Academic Plan; used by students, advisors and faculty to develop students’ curricular pathways, guide registration processes, inform course scheduling and monitor success patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my.sinclair / our.sinclair</td>
<td>Intranet sites serving students and faculty/staff respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBOR</td>
<td>Ohio Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Ohio Transfer Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Personal Assessment of the College Environment; Sinclair’s primary tool for benchmarking and gathering measures of employee satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDSA</td>
<td>Plan, Do, Study, Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEO</td>
<td>Post-Secondary Enrollment Option; for high school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>Research, Analytics, and Reporting; the office that performs the institutional research functions of the College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Software; application behind the DAWN Information Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDIC</td>
<td>Staff Development and Innovation Committee; a cross-institutional group of both faculty and staff that meet regularly to plan and execute professional development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSE</td>
<td>Survey of Entering Student Engagement <a href="http://www.ccsse.org/sense/">http://www.ccsse.org/sense/</a>; used to benchmark findings between and among comparative institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>“Student Success Plan; comprehensive student success model incorporating ILP as part of a holistic counseling and intervention system; utilizes a web-based counseling record management system”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>Transfer Assurance Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS</td>
<td>Unmanned Aerial Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebAdvisor</td>
<td>Tool for accessing Sinclair databases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>