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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. 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 $135 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. Meetings across campus often begin with a review of these four Core Strategies, ensuring that these strategies, and the institutional values of which they are an extension, are reinforced across the institution.

As Sinclair approaches its 130th year of continuous operations, there are a number of notable Sinclair characteristics and exemplars:

• 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 thanks to levy support by the taxpayers of Montgomery County
• New cutting edge workforce programs, including unmanned aerial systems, cyber security, and competency based education in Information Technology
• Very large numbers of nationally recognized and honored students, faculty, administrators, and trustees
• Impressively high community approval and quality assessment ratings
• No financial debt, minimal deferred maintenance, and ample strategic financial reserves allocated to future needs
• Receipt of many significant private, federal, and state grants

Sinclair’s vision statement, adopted in 1994, sets forth the institution’s values and strategic vision, and emphasizes the institution’s commitment to access for students from diverse backgrounds, a high quality learning environment, and community support.

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.

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.
In recent years, overall headcount at Sinclair has totaled between 18,000 and 23,000 unique students each Fall term. Figure O.3 provides the most recent information on 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>43% male 57% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>45% male 55% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>48% male 52% female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL-TIME / PART-TIME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% full-time 68% part-time</td>
<td>33% less than 20 40% 20-29 14% 30-39 13% 40 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% full-time 69% part-time</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% full-time 47% part-time</td>
<td>na</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 Couseview Campus Center in Warren County. Figure O.4 displays a map of the various Sinclair additional 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 approximately 50 students total to offering 180 different online courses to approximately 6,000 students each term. Sinclair currently offers 14 associate degrees, 6 online one-year certificates, and 9 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 four new ones have begun. Figure O.6 displays AQIP Action Projects that have been closed and initiated during that period.

In recent years 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 needed for their success.

With its rich heritage of more than 130 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>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Programs (AAS)</td>
<td>Career and Technical Programs prepare students for employment upon graduation.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Programs (CRT)</td>
<td>One-half of an associate degree, consisting of 45 - 55 credit hours.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Certificates (STC)</td>
<td>Designed for a specific employment situation, consisting of fewer than 30 credit hours.</td>
<td>116</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>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>258</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>Conducting an Institutional Policy Review with a Completion Focus</td>
<td>The primary goals of this Action Project include:</td>
<td>12-01-2012</td>
<td>10-29-2015</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>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>12-17-2013</td>
<td>10-01-2016</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>12-17-2013</td>
<td>10-30-2015</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>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Sustainable Structure to Support Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship</td>
<td>Establishment of a sustainable structure for centralized accountability for diversity goals in the following areas to assure effective implementation across the institution:</td>
<td>01-01-2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updated Diversity Approach – development of an institutional-level blueprint that creates a structure for proposal, initiation, coordination and monitoring of diversity efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty and Staff Development – to be accomplished predominantly through the Center for Teaching and Learning’s Diversity &amp; Inclusion Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotion of Instructional Strategies for the Classroom – scaling strategies developed through the RESPECT Learning Challenge Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased Awareness of the New Cultural Diversity &amp; Global Citizenship General Education Outcome – plan for faculty development in this area across several platforms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Student Complaint Processes</td>
<td>Sinclair has processes in place to collect student complaints and other forms of student feedback, but these processes are currently decentralized. Tracking complaints and their resolution – and reporting on trends – is challenging given the current decentralized structure. The goal of this project is the enhancement of our student complaint processes in terms of coordination, tracking, and analysis. At the completion of this project, there will be documented improvement in the following:</td>
<td>12-01-12</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the visibility and student awareness of Sinclair’s student complaint processes, particularly in terms of website access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ability to track student complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis and reporting of student complaint data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• steps taken to address common student complaints and the impact of those steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Alignment of Updated Curriculum and Website Processes</td>
<td>Sinclair’s current curriculum approval processes prevent newly approved curriculum from being displayed on the website until courses and programs become active at the beginning of the subsequent Fall term. Consequently, while registration for an upcoming Fall term begins in mid-April, the curriculum displayed on the website may differ from the curriculum for the upcoming Fall term for which students are registering. The goal of this Action Project is to refine and realign Sinclair’s curriculum approval processes with the website content in time to allow updated curriculum to be displayed on the website during the registration period, beginning Fall 2017.</td>
<td>07-01-2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlining Application and Admissions Processes</td>
<td>Enrollment is a critical and, at times, stressful period for a student. When information, steps, and processes are not clearly defined, communicated, and executed, prospective students may become confused, overwhelmed, and ultimately decide not to attend Sinclair—or any college. To improve Sinclair’s student experience, to communicate clear, concise steps to enrollment for all students, and decrease time from application to enrollment, the college will streamline enrollment processes. Bringing together the many stakeholders in the enrollment process—New Student Enrollment, Regional Locations, eLearning, Registration, Testing Center, Advising, High School programs, IT, Research, Analytics, and Reporting, and Financial Aid—will allow the AQIP team to evaluate and improve the enrollment experience, and decrease average time from application to enrollment.</td>
<td>11-01-2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sinclair Community College has been involved in General Education assessment in its academic programs since the mid-1990s, when it’s 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. Beginning in Fall 2015, Sinclair began a pilot to collect direct assessment measures of its Oral and Written Communication General Education outcomes, with a view to expanding this approach to all other General Education outcomes.

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 outlines - 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.

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 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

CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

Category 1 focuses on the design, deployment and effectiveness of teaching-learning processes (and the processes required to support them) that underlie the institution’s credit and non-credit programs and courses.

1.1: COMMON LEARNING OUTCOMES

Common Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

Describe the processes for determining, communicating, and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes and identify 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. 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”. Sinclair’s common learning outcomes (designated institutionally as General Education outcomes) were designed to align with these specific aspects of our mission statement at an appropriate level for community college students (addresses Core component 3.B.1). As will be discussed in subsequent sections, data regarding achievement of these outcomes is made available on the Sinclair website in Annual Update reports and Program Review self-studies, providing evidence that Sinclair is meeting its mission as students demonstrate mastery of these outcomes (these reports and self-studies are available at http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/program-reports and self-studies are available at http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/program-department-review) (addresses Core component 3.E.2).

• Determining common outcomes (Core component 3.B.2, 4.B.4)

The initial Sinclair General Education Committee that developed the common learning outcomes consisted of a cross-functional group of faculty and staff in addition to local educational and community leaders. The Sinclair 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 subheading components that further articulate these outcomes. Sinclair has had the same basic six General Education outcomes throughout the past 15 years, although the cross-functional Assessment Committee completed extensive revisions to two of these General Education outcomes that were approved by Instructional Council.

Within the past few years, the Assessment Committee revised the Computer Literacy General Education outcome and competencies to keep pace with technology skills required by employers of Sinclair graduates. Subsequently, the Values/Citizenship/Community General Education outcome was also revised and renamed Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship. In both cases, revision to the common outcomes were performed using the following process:

• The Assessment Committee works continuously with the General Education outcomes, monitoring assessment results and revising rubrics as needed. In the course of this ongoing work, the Committee responded to feedback from faculty doing this work that these two outcomes were outdated and needed to be re-examined.

• A faculty-led, cross-functional subgroup of the Assessment Committee spent a year researching the issue, examining similar common learning outcomes at other institutions, and drafting a new version with input from students, faculty, and other stakeholders, including employers.

• Revisions were submitted to and approved by the following college committees which are composed of representatives from across campus:
  o Assessment Committee (three to five faculty representatives from each division, Faculty Senate representatives)
  o Curriculum Committee (one member from each division, one Chairperson from each division, Chair of the Assessment Committee, coordinator of Student Success Course)
  o Instructional Council (Chief Academic Officer, Deans of Academic Divisions and Learning Centers, President and Vice President of Faculty Senate, Chairs of Assessment, Academic Policies, Adjunct Faculty, Curriculum, and Online Teaching and Learning Committees, Directors of the Library, Academic Advising, Tech Prep, and Enrollment Management)

• Once approved by Instructional Council, these General Education outcomes were changed on Sinclair’s website, in the course catalog, and in the Curriculum Management Tool (CMT) where information on curriculum is maintained. The process above is how common learning outcomes are determined and maintained at Sinclair Community College. The Assessment Committee is responsible for identifying and initiating needed changes, which must then be approved by Curriculum Committee and Instructional Council.

Figure 1.2 displays the updates to the Computer Literacy and Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship General Education outcomes.

Through the Assessment Committee, not only do faculty take the lead in the development and maintenance of the General Education outcomes, they also lead assessment of these outcomes, as will be discussed in subsequent sections (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)

Figure 1.1 provided an overview of the content of Sinclair’s General Education outcomes. By design, Sinclair has infused the General Education outcomes throughout program curricula. Every program that Sinclair offers must ensure that students achieve each of the General Education outcomes at some point in the program curriculum. As part of the Annual Update process, every year each academic department is sent a spreadsheet illustrating where they have indicated each General Education outcome can be assessed for mastery in their programs, with a request to indicate any updates to that information. An example of this curriculum mapping for General Education outcomes for Sinclair’s Nursing program is provided in Figure 1.3, which illustrates how each associate degree program at Sinclair has a specification of the point at which mastery will be assessed for each of the General Education outcomes (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 cultural diversity and global citizenship 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 the content and level of achievement for the outcome. Assessment of Oral Communication occurs in required Communications courses in each program, and assessment of Written Communication occurs in required English courses in each program. For the other General Education outcomes, departments must specify where assessment of that outcome will occur, and every year in the Annual Update submission, departments are charged with reporting their assessment results for at least one of these General Education outcomes, and describing any changes that have been made as a result of assessment data. Sinclair’s goal is that each graduate will achieve mastery — as defined within the description of the General Education outcome — by the time of graduation (addresses Core component 4.B.1).
### GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM MAPPING EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE CODE</th>
<th>COURSE NAME</th>
<th>MASTERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALH 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Healthcare Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALH 2202</td>
<td>General Pharmacology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 1141</td>
<td>Principles of Anatomy &amp; Physiology I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 1242</td>
<td>Principles of Anatomy &amp; Physiology II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 2206</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 1130</td>
<td>Allied Health Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 1200</td>
<td>Introduction to Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 1400</td>
<td>Health &amp; Illness I: Foundational Concepts in Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 1450</td>
<td>Professional Nursing I: Introduction to the Role of the Professional Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 1600</td>
<td>Health &amp; Illness II: Health &amp; Wellness Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 1650</td>
<td>Professional Nursing II: Healthcare System Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 2400</td>
<td>Health &amp; Illness III: Concepts in Managing Complex Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 2450</td>
<td>Professional Nursing III: Leadership &amp; Management of Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG 2600</td>
<td>Concept Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 100</td>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLEX REQUIREMENT (BIO 2205 OR CHE 111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 1.3

#### 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. Each year numerous members of the Committee work with the assessment results of outcomes and help revise and implement rubrics used in those assessments, and through this process the need for improvements or updates in outcomes is surfaced. As noted previously, the Committee recently revised the Computer Literacy outcome to remain relevant to student and employer needs. Similarly, the Committee recognized that the Values, Citizenship, and Community General Education outcome did not address diversity and global interconnectedness to the degree required of graduates in today’s globalized environment. 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 process used in both of these revisions was described previously in the section on “Determining common outcomes”.

The Committee is revisiting the other outcomes as new General Education rubrics are being developed and refined over the coming year that will better allow faculty to measure these outcomes using course assignments that are aligned to them. The current General Education rubrics can be reviewed at [http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/assessment-of-student-learning/general-education-rubrics/](http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/assessment-of-student-learning/general-education-rubrics/).

### FIGURE 1.4

#### ANNUAL SERVICE LEARNING PARTICIPATION

![Graph showing annual service learning participation from 2010 to 2016](http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/assessment-of-student-learning/general-education-rubrics/)
Service Learning participation has grown substantially since 2008, and the impact on students who participate is significant. In 2013, the Service Learning office 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/assessment-of-student-learning/service-learning/.

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 (http://www.sinclair.edu/student-life/sce/campus-life/clubs-and-organizations/phi-theta-kappa/)
- Sinclair Ohio Fellows Leadership Development Program (http://www.sinclair.edu/student-life/sce/leadership-development/ohio-fellows/)
- African American Culture Club (http://www.sinclair.edu/student-life/sce/campus-life/clubs-and-organizations/)
- BriTe SiGnaL Alliance (http://www.sinclair.edu/student-life/sce/campus-life/clubs-and-organizations/)

A more extensive list of campus organizations can be found at http://www.sinclair.edu/student-life/sce/campus-life/clubs-and-organizations/.

Other co-curricular learning opportunities include campus theatre productions, musical performances, The Clarion campus newspaper, and student athletics, all of which provide opportunities for practical experience with material that is learned in class and for further development of General Education outcomes. In addition, internship and co-op opportunities are available in many programs, and are described in more detail in 1P2.

- 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)

In the past Sinclair has taken a three-pronged approach to assessment of common learning outcomes:

- Individual academic departments reporting their assessment work on General Education outcomes in Annual Update and Program Review submissions.
- Centralized, institution-wide assessment involving student self-ratings on General Education outcomes in a campus-wide survey.
- Employer feedback on graduate performance related to several General Education outcomes.

However, Sinclair has recognized limitations with the first two of these approaches. While having academic departments assess General Education outcomes using their own individual approaches gave the departments a great deal of flexibility in assessment, it also made it impossible to aggregate these results across the college as a whole. While the student survey self-ratings on General Education outcomes provided institutional-level data, self-ratings have severe limitations in terms of validity of results, in that students are not always the best judges of their own abilities. Of the three approaches used historically at Sinclair, employer ratings of Sinclair graduates provided the best data, and continue to be an important source of information.

The Assessment Committee decided to develop a new approach to improve the quality of assessment of General Education outcomes, and for the first time obtain direct evidence of mastery of these outcomes. Beginning in Fall 2015 a pilot was begun that targeted the Oral Communication and Written Communication General Education outcomes. Three key courses that are required in almost all associate degree programs were targeted: COM 2206 - Interpersonal Communication and COM 2211 – Effective Public Speaking for the Oral Communication outcome, and ENG 1101 – English Composition I for Written Communication. Faculty in these departments were asked to identify a final exam or activity where students would display mastery of the relevant General Education outcome, and in the process of grading that exam or assignment complete an additional rubric assessing how well each student demonstrated mastery of the Oral Communication or Written Communication outcome. Results from Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 demonstrated the feasibility of the approach, but revealed opportunities for improvement. These improvement opportunities were addressed in a revised Oral Communication rubric launched in a Fall 2016 pilot, and the Written Communication rubric is currently being revised in Spring 2017. In both cases the rubrics are being revised such that a single rubric can be used for both grading the assignment for the purposes of the course (Sinclair’s definition of evaluation) and assessment of the General Education outcome to determine an institution-wide level of mastery, substantially reducing the workload on faculty while providing information adequate for these two very different information needs (addresses Core components 4.B.1, 4.B.2, and 4.B.4). Eventually this approach will be expanded to all General Education outcomes. Departments will be provided with data for their student specifically, and will be asked what opportunities for improvements in student learning in their departments are suggested by the results. Preliminary data from the pilots for this new approach is provided in section 1R1, in the meantime Sinclair also continues to use the three methods listed above that have been used historically.
What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- **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 mentioned in section 1P1, historically General Education outcomes at Sinclair have been 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). 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 1.5 provides some examples of General Education assessment work reported by four different departments in their Annual Update submissions. General Education assessment results for all academic departments can be found in the Annual Updates and Program Review self-studies available via this link: [http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/program-department-review/](http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/program-department-review/).

### 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>Year 1: 89% (\geq 80%) 70% (\geq 90%) 63% (\geq 68%) 79% (\geq 79%) 89% (\geq 89%) 90% (\geq 91%) Year 2: 89% (\geq 80%) 70% (\geq 90%) 63% (\geq 68%) 79% (\geq 79%) 89% (\geq 89%) 90% (\geq 91%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving</th>
<th>All programs</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th><strong>Assessment Methods Listed</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Item Average - 92.6% (n=397)</strong></td>
<td><strong>% OVER</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Program Outcome.</strong></td>
<td><strong>37% above Competent or Expert Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
<td><strong>% OVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving</strong></td>
<td><strong>45% Competent to Perform Independently</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td><strong>% OVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving</strong></td>
<td><strong>18% rated below Competent to Perform Independently</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>% OVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACC 1220 Financial Statement Analysis Project** is used to assess critical thinking skills. The chart above reflects the percentage of students who scored over 70%, over 80%, and over 90% by term. The data indicates that over 89% of the students met the 70% minimum requirement for mastery of the outcome.

<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>Year 1: Average Grade for Mystery Shop paper BIS 1400: 16.95/25 (68%) 16.04/25 (65%) BIS 1400: 16.95/25 (68%) BIS 1400: 16.04/25 (65%) 21220: 16.95/25 (68%) 16.04/25 (65%) 21220: 16.95/25 (68%) 16.04/25 (65%) 21220: 16.95/25 (68%) 16.04/25 (65%) 21220: 16.95/25 (68%) 16.04/25 (65%) 21220: 16.95/25 (68%) 16.04/25 (65%) 21220: 16.95/25 (68%) 16.04/25 (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class average scores greater than 80%**

<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>Year 1: ACC 1220 Financial Statement Analysis Project is used to assess critical thinking skills. The chart above reflects the percentage of students who scored over 70%, over 80%, and over 90% by term. The data indicates that over 89% of the students met the 70% minimum requirement for mastery of the outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HESI Report for 2012-13 AY Capstone Student performance in eight (8) categories related to critical thinking.**

**Employer Satisfaction Survey on Critical Thinking program outcome. (n=23)**

**Healthy People 2020 Project Rubric_manual**

**Graduate Satisfaction Survey on Critical Thinking program outcome. (n=41)**

**Expected at each degree level?**
HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

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 employers to rate Sinclair graduates on several of the General Education Outcomes. Relevant results can be found in Figure 1.7.

These results represent a sample of the General Education assessment data traditionally collected by Sinclair. As described in section 1P1, the Assessment Committee is working on an exciting new approach that involves direct assessment of General Education outcomes using class assignments that are aligned with the outcomes. Initial work has been completed for the Oral Communication and Written Communication General Education outcomes, and the currently available data is provided in the pages that follow. Sinclair is working to expand this approach to the other General Education outcomes. Several courses piloted rubrics measuring the Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship general education outcome in Fall 2016, but data from that work was not available for inclusion in the current Systems Portfolio.

Figure 1.8 displays data from the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 pilots of direct assessment of the Oral Communications General Education outcome in sections of COM 2206 – Interpersonal Communication and COM 2211 – Effective Public Speaking. Faculty used a rubric and determined, with each student submission, whether the student displayed mastery, defined as demonstrating mastery of the outcome at least 70% of the time in the assignment. The pilot included 15 of 51 COM 2211 sections offered in Fall 2015 and 13 of 65 COM 2206 sections offered in Spring 2016, with plans to expand the number of sections in future terms.

Similarly, a pilot was performed in ENG 1101 – English Composition I collecting direct assessment data on the Written Communication General Education outcome. As was the case with the Oral Communication pilot, faculty used a rubric and determined with each student submission whether the student displayed mastery, defined as demonstrating mastery of the outcome 70% of the time. The pilot included 12 of 145 ENG 1101 sections offered in Fall 2015 and 22 of 96 ENG 1101 sections offered in Spring 2016, with plans to expand the number of sections in future terms. Results are displayed in Figure 1.9.

Regarding data from co-curricular programs, as mentioned in section 1P1 in the past year the Service Learning office increased its efforts to
collect feedback from students on their perceptions of participating in a Service Learning experience. Students agreed with several stated benefits of the program. For example, as can be seen in Figure 1.10, students expressed a high level of agreement that they received substantial benefits from participating in Service Learning experiences. Not that comparisons are made to the 2013-14 Service Learning Survey results which were provided in the previous Systems Portfolio, but which had only 20 respondents, in comparison to the 427 responses since that time. The Service Learning office uses the results from the survey to suggest areas of improvement, although in both administrations results were overwhelmingly positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Communication Direct Assessment Results - Fall 2015 and Spring 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Component</td>
<td>n=172 students in 13 sections</td>
<td>n=166 students in 15 sections</td>
<td>n=338 students in 28 sections</td>
<td>n=489 students in 34 sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate in ways that recognize diverse opinions, cultural differences, individual differences reinforce conflict management.</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
<td>Passing: 70% of the time or greater</td>
<td>Percent Mastered</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills reinforce conflict management</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes cultural differences in communication interactions</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes diverse opinions in communication interactions</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes individual differences in communication interactions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compose and organize oral communication messages appropriately.</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
<td>Passing: 70% of the time or greater</td>
<td>Percent Mastered</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composes oral messages appropriate to an intended audience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs relevant and clear questions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes ideas in a logical and purposeful way</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the use of effective listening behaviors.</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
<td>Passing: 70% of the time or greater</td>
<td>Percent Mastered</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective listening behaviors</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use attentive, effective and respectful listening behaviors</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally paraphrase information and opposing points of view</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use effective verbal and non-verbal skills to deliver appropriate messages effectively.</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
<td>Passing: 70% of the time or greater</td>
<td>Percent Mastered</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers oral messages appropriate to the audience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain ideas using a variety of oral communication methods</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases questions to obtain information in a variety of interactions</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses effective verbal and non-verbal skills</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Communication Direct Assessment Results - Fall 2015 and Spring 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Component</td>
<td>n=193 students in 12 sections</td>
<td>n=296 students in 22 sections</td>
<td>n=489 students in 34 sections</td>
<td>n=489 students in 34 sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Subcomponent</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
<td>Passing: 70% of the time or greater</td>
<td>Percent Mastered</td>
<td>Failing: Less than 70% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Response: Appropriately and effectively incorporate another writer’s material.</td>
<td>Read and respond critically to another writer’s material</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of the message: Prepare written material whose message is shaped to appeal to appropriate audiences</td>
<td>Shape messages to appeal to appropriate audiences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures of composition: Prepare written material that applies the correct structures of composition.</td>
<td>Compose works using the correct structures of composition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics and Controlling Ideas: Select a topic that is clear, manageable, flows logically, and has sufficient supporting examples.</td>
<td>Arrange ideas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate and select logical and sufficient</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and develop clear topics and</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interpretation of results and insights gained**

The historically used approaches to assessing General Education outcomes at Sinclair seem to indicate that students are mastering the outcomes. Generally, departments report high levels of achievement of General Education outcomes in their Annual Update submissions to the Provost’s Office. On the whole, students’ self-ratings indicate confidence in their skills related to General Education outcomes, as can be seen in Figure 1.6. In addition, Figure 1.7 provides external evidence from employers that our students are achieving these outcomes.

However, the shortcomings of some of the historically used approaches for assessing General Education outcomes were discussed in 1P1, and pointed to the need to attempt direct assessment of these outcomes. Pilots for Oral Communication and Written Communication using rubrics were performed in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, and provided the following insights:

- The Assessment Committee determined that using rubrics with assignments aligned with General Education outcomes is a feasible approach for providing a more direct assessment of General Education outcomes.
- Examination of the results lead to questions about the appropriateness of the rubrics used. Note in Figure 1.8 and Figure 1.9 that some components of the outcomes have markedly lower mastery percentages than others. Typical assessment practice would say that these are areas where improvements in student learning could be made, and further examination bore this out for some components. But subsequent investigation also indicated that some faculty who used the rubrics felt that the assignments used were not aligned well with some parts of the rubric, and some faculty were confused about how to use the rubric when an assignment didn’t seem to apply to a part of the rubric. For some parts of the General Education Oral and Written Communication outcomes the assignment aligned well, but not as well for others. Since the rubric did not have a “not applicable” rating option, faculty were inconsistent in rating those components, sometimes leaving them blank, which accounts for the lower n sizes for some analysis components.

- **Faculty participating in the pilot were completing two separate rubrics** – one for grading the assignment, and a second for General Education assessment purposes. The need to use two separate rubrics when grading an assignment was burdensome to faculty during a particularly busy time of year for them.

**Based on 1R1, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?** (Core Component 4.B.3)

Sinclair has long engaged in assessment of its General Education outcomes, relying on a structure where these outcomes have been built into all of offered programs. During the once every five-year Program Reviews the General Education assessment work initiated by a department is discussed, and recommendations for improvement are given, where needed. Sinclair plans 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. Initial work in this area has been promising – pilots performed in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 provided data that led to the following conclusions:

- **Direct assessment of General Education outcomes is possible through the use of rubrics used to score assignments that are appropriately aligned with the outcome.**
- **However, the rubrics used in the pilots needed improvement.** General Education outcomes were disaggregated into components on the rubric, the components weren’t always applicable to the assignment, but no “not applicable” option was provided on the rubric. Furthermore, the use of separate grading rubrics and assessment rubrics for the same assignment was cumbersome for faculty.

In response to the above findings from the direct assessment pilots, in Fall 2016 two subcommittees of the Assessment Committee began revising the rubrics used in the direct assessment pilots with two goals in mind:

- **Adaptation of the rubrics to address shortcomings identified as part of the pilot, particularly in terms of providing a “not applicable” option.**
• Merging the grading rubric and General Education assessment rubrics such that a single rubric could be used for both purposes in the Communication and English Composition courses where Oral Communication and Written Communication are being directly assessed.

These revised rubrics have been piloted in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017. In addition, the pilot for use of a rubric for direct assessment of Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship is ongoing in several courses that directly address this outcome. Development of rubrics for the other three General Education outcomes for use in direct assessment is ongoing in a subcommittee of the Assessment Committee.

Sinclair's vision is that within the coming years the traditional, limited approaches to General Education at Sinclair will be significantly strengthened by the new direct assessment measures. Direct assessment with the use of revised rubrics of Oral Communication will be accomplished in the Interpersonal Communication and Public Speaking courses, Written Communication in the English Composition courses, and Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship in appropriate courses required in a substantial portion of our programs of study. For these three General Education outcomes, courses required in all programs will provide assessment results that can be both aggregated at the campus level, and also disaggregated to the program level, allowing the Assessment Committee to provide departments with data on how well the students in their programs are mastering the General Education outcomes. The Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 pilots provided excellent insights in moving this vision forward. For the remaining three General Education outcomes, rubrics will be provided in the Learning Management System (LMS) for use by departments. In 2014 and 2015 departments were tasked with determining courses in their programs where mastery of these three outcomes could be assessed, so departments should already know in which courses these LMS based rubrics could be used. While the Oral Communication, Written Communication, and Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship pilots are currently the priority, eventually direct assessment data for Information Literacy, Computer Literacy, and Critical Thinking and Problems Solving from the LMS rubrics will be aggregated across the institution.

These efforts are still in their infancy, but Sinclair feels that the first steps taken towards a greater reliance on direct assessment data in assessment of General Education outcomes has been promising. The historic approaches to General Education assessment have provided useful data, and employer ratings of Sinclair graduates in terms of mastery of General Education outcomes have been particularly important. However, it is Sinclair's feeling that we are currently poised to move our General Education assessment to the next level, with direct assessment approaches providing less limited data than we have collected in the past. In the future, we will continue to ask departments in

Annual Update and Program Review submissions the key questions we have always asked regarding assessment that “close the loop”:
• Are changes planned as a result of assessment of outcomes? If so, what are those changes?
• How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?

1.2: PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Program Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills, and abilities graduates from particular programs are expected to possess. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P2 Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated program learning outcomes and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Aligning learning outcomes for programs (e.g., nursing, business administration, elementary teaching, etc.) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (Core Component 3.E.2)

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 Curriculum Review Committee perform reviews to ensure that each new academic program has appropriate and measurable outcomes. Assessment of these outcomes is required and serves to document 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 while continuously improving the programs it offers. Assessment results are made available to the public in the Program Review and Annual Update documents posted to the Provost's website (https://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/program-department-review/) (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. As part of semester conversion prior to 2012, all program outcomes were reviewed for quality and measurability. The process for determining program outcomes is as follows: as new programs are proposed, department faculty develop at least three 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,

The Process for Development of Program Outcomes

- Department discovers need for new program through environmental scanning or advisory Committee feedback, completes the “New Program Template” with at least three measurable program outcomes based on identified need.
- Program proposal - which includes the program outcomes - is reviewed by the division dean, the Curriculum Review Committee and the Manager of Curriculum, Transfer, and Articulation.
- Program outcomes are stored in the Curriculum Management Tool (CMT) with other program curriculum information.
- Program outcomes are included in the Annual Update and Program Review templates for the department with expectation assessment results will be provided.

FIGURE 1.11 
THE PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES

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 division dean, Curriculum Review Committee, and the Manager of Curriculum, Transfer and Articulation in the Provost’s Office provide 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

Accounting - ACC.S.AAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>To which course(s) is this program outcome related?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 101, LAW 1102, MAN 1101, MRK 2101, ECO 2160, ECO 2180, ACC 1510, MAN 2110, 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>

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 that outcomes require modification, 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 for all of the department’s associate degree programs 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 (see Figure 1.11).

• 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 allows 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
Helping Students Learn

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.

### PROGRAM OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>To Which Courses or Other Program Outcomes Related</th>
<th>Year Assessed or to be Assessed</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>What Were the Assessment Results? (Please provide brief summary data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying 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 2101, ACC 2102, ACC 2211, 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 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>

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.

- 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, eight years ago, was enhanced by a visiting scholar grant, and a nationally-renowned expert on integrated design was brought in to work with faculty that first year developing the project. 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 worked with the Civil Engineering Department at the University of Dayton on a joint interdisciplinary project for the capstone.

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 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 the program outcomes it has developed, and this accountability is reviewed annually through assessment data submitted in conjunction with the Annual Update process, with a more in-depth examination 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).

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, who offer multiple training opportunities for assessment of program outcomes. In addition, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offers a Curriculum and Assessment track that consists of six workshops that train faculty in assessment, which is an additional resource provided to departments. 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 in ways that make sense in their specific 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 for program outcomes. 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 the aforementioned CTL workshops. Annual Update/Program Review feedback, and the availability of one-on-one help from Divisional Assessment Coordinators.
What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected in programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- **Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution (i.e., how many programs are/not assessing program goals)**
- **Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)**
- **Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks**

Each department is required to assess at least one of its program outcomes each year (as reported in Annual Updates) and must have assessed each program outcome a minimum of at least once 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 every year through the Annual Update. In these recommendations, departments are referred to their Divisional Assessment Coordinators for help in improving assessment of program outcomes.

**Figure 1.14** provides an example of a department that received a recommendation to improve its program outcome measures and the progress that this department reported in one of its Annual Update submissions.

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 program outcome assessment processes throughout Sinclair’s academic departments.

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 and using the data to make improvements and corrections.

**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.

**PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

**TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED**

**ASSESSMENT METHODS USED**

**WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PROGRESS OR RATIONALE FOR NO LONGER APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop means to document direct measures of general education outcomes and program outcomes, and demonstrate how data are being used to improve learning outcomes.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

**TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED**

**ASSESSMENT METHODS USED**

**WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>PROGRAM OUTCOMES TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHODS USED</th>
<th>WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM OUTCOMES</strong></td>
<td><strong>TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT METHODS USED</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop means to document direct measures of general education outcomes and program outcomes, and demonstrate how data are being used to improve learning outcomes.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALH 1101, ALH 2202, BIO 1440, BIO 2202, BIO 2208, COM 2206, ENG 1101, MAT 1130, NSG 1100, NSG 1101, NSG 1102, PSY 1100</strong></td>
<td><strong>HESI Report for 2012-13.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SIMILARPROGRAM OUTCOMES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze and synthesize data.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALH 1101, ALH 2202, BIO 1440, BIO 2202, BIO 2208, COM 2206, ENG 1101, MAT 1130, NSG 1100, NSG 1101, NSG 1102, NSG 2200, NSG 2201, NSG 2202, NSG 2203, NSG 2206, NSG 2210, PSY 1100, PSY 2200</strong></td>
<td><strong>HESI Report for 2012-13.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SIMILARPROGRAM OUTCOMES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze and synthesize data.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALH 1101, ALH 2202, BIO 1440, BIO 2202, BIO 2208, COM 2206, ENG 1101, MAT 1130, NSG 1100, NSG 1101, NSG 1102, NSG 2200, NSG 2201, NSG 2202, NSG 2203, NSG 2206, NSG 2210, PSY 1100, PSY 2200</strong></td>
<td><strong>HESI Report for 2012-13.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SIMILARPROGRAM OUTCOMES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

**TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED**

**YEAR ASSESSED OR TO BE ASSESSED**

**ASSESSMENT METHODS USED**

**WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>PROGRAM OUTCOMES TO WHICH COURSE(S) IS THIS PROGRAM OUTCOME RELATED</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHODS USED</th>
<th>WHAT WERE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS? (PLEASE PROVIDE BRIEF SUMMARY DATA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrate ability to think logically and solve problems using analysis, synthesis and evaluation.</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAT 1440, 1470</strong></td>
<td><strong>2012-13</strong></td>
<td><strong>By the time of the Annual Update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognize and articulate an understanding of the increasing interdependence of world cultures and their consequences.</strong></td>
<td><strong>LIT 2234</strong></td>
<td><strong>2012-13</strong></td>
<td><strong>By the time of the Annual Update</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that in the Annual Update template, after reporting data similar to that in the examples provided above, 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/program-department-review/. As discussed in IP2, the Multi-disciplinary Capstone Project sought assessment responses 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 32 program outcomes rated, the lowest rating received by a team on the nine point scale was a 7. Attendees were also asked to give an overall rating of the Capstone Event, and the overall mean rating across all attendees was 8.6 on a 9 point scale.

**Figure 1.18** provides examples of ratings provided by advisory board attendees at the Capstone Event. These examples are ratings of the student teams from two departments – Architectural Technology and Construction Management – out of the six departments that received ratings 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. Seventeen respondents provided a total of forty evaluations for eight of the nine Capstone teams; team six did not have any evaluations. Of these respondents, eight were Capstone Advisory Board members and eight were guests at the event; the remaining respondent identified as a faculty member. Four respondents identified as being under the age of forty, and six respondents reported that they had earned a Master’s degree or doctorate. Three fourths of the respondents reported having 10 or more years of professional experience in their field.
• Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

Sinclair has benefited tremendously from the longstanding 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. However, now that most academic departments have been through the current Program Review process at least twice, it is clear in the discussions that are part of that process that some departments have a much greater understanding of the importance of assessment and how best to engage in it than others. Generally the departments who are better at it are those whose accrediting bodies require them to perform program outcome assessment. One important insight that has resulted from our experience is that our efforts to improve assessment of program outcomes need to be targeted to departments that do not have external accreditation requirements. This is being addressed in Program Review meetings with departments that struggle with program outcome assessment.

Another key insight has been that the use of common assignments, activities and exams greatly facilitates assessment work. Some of our current efforts involve helping departments see the benefits of having at least a few common activities, assignments and/or exams that would allow them to get a bird’s eye view of how well students are achieving the outcomes that have been set for them. Some departments have embraced this approach – in Sinclair’s Communications Department, for example, all courses in the department have common exams and assignments, and this allows for rich and robust collection and analysis of assessment data. Similarly, the Math Department has adopted common exams in all of its courses. These departments have significant advantages compared to others when they are asked to demonstrate how well students are achieving program outcomes, because they have measures that allow for standardized comparisons and benchmarking across all of the sections of their courses. We are incorporating suggestions regarding this into the Program Review recommendations for departments that don’t have any common exams or assignments, and will follow up with them via the Annual Update process regarding their progress.

Departments that practice assessment well generally report high levels of outcome achievement for their students. There have been many examples shared in Program Review meetings where departments noted a dip in assessment related scores and made changes as a result, and whenever this occurs departments receive commendations from the review team praising their use of good assessment practice. Sinclair works hard to educate department faculty that the real purpose of outcome assessment is to continuously improve our ability to help students achieve their educational goals. In the Annual Update submissions, departments respond to these questions:

• 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 regularly reinforce the idea that the true purpose of program outcome assessment is to increase student learning through continuous improvement of our academic programs. Knowing to what extent students can demonstrate mastery of program outcomes should lead to changes designed to help gain mastery, along with measurements to help departments know whether their interventions achieved the intended effect and help Sinclair better communicate and improve college-wide assessment.

112 Based on 1R2, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (Core Component 4.B.3)

In the Annual Update and Program Review processes, Sinclair has an excellent mechanism for monitoring department assessment of program outcomes and for providing feedback where assessment efforts need to be improved. The Annual Update serves as an interim report on the program assessment work the department is doing, and the Program Review provides an in-depth examination of ongoing program assessment every five years, with the opportunity for review teams to recommend improvements to assessment processes and practices, for those improvements to be monitored yearly in Annual Update submissions, and to communicate best practices for improvement college-wide. Figure 1.19 provides a graphic representation of how assessment work is monitored and feedback is provided departments regarding their General Education outcome and program outcome assessment work.
1.3: ACADEMIC PROGRAM DESIGN

Academic Program Design focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders’ needs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.C. and 4.A. in this section.

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 the following:

- 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 stakeholder 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 work done by Sinclair’s Department of Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR). RAR conducts surveys, designs educational research studies, and engages in survey, data mining, and modeling work to provide information regarding needs of these groups and how the institution can better meet them.

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 to closely track minority students, low-socioeconomic students, different ethnic groups, and Pell grant recipients in their data reporting (addresses Core components 1.C.1 and 1.C.2).

Sinclair disseminates data across the campus through the RAR-maintained DAWN online 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, gender, and Pell grant status. Figure 1.21 provides an example of a DAWN report broken out by subgroups.
Sinclair uses this information to inform strategies and 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. During the early weeks of classes, employees contacted 420 students in Fall 2015, with 81 contacted in the Summer of 2016.

Sinclair has also developed the African American Male Initiative (AAMI), which is designed for African American males aged 18 to 26 who have completed less than 30 credit hours and live in Montgomery County. The four main goals for participants of AAMI are to promote increases in:
- Degree Completion
- Term to term persistence rate
- Maintain a GPA in good standing
- Personal and professional development and building community among students

While outcomes are being tracked, the initiative is in its infancy, and no data is currently available. As of Spring 2017 there were 19 members.

In addition, Sinclair has developed a chapter of Brother-to-Brother, which is a student-led social club that is part of the Student African American Brotherhood (SAAB). Weekly meetings are geared toward academic, professional, and personal development, with 22 members as of Spring 2017. (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:
- Continuously tracking changes in population groups within the service region to surface new needs and determine how to address them
- Identification of opportunities or unmet needs gathered through stakeholder outreach
- Closely monitoring trends in the local economy, in addition to closely monitoring changes in state or federal regulations or accreditation requirements.

One excellent example of this approach is the development of the Courseview Campus location. While monitoring population trends in the mid-2000s as part of the strategic planning process, Sinclair became aware that there would be substantial growth in the 15-19 and 20-29 age groups directly to the south in 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 since that time Sinclair has built a second building at the location and acquired several parcels of surrounding property in anticipation of future growth. As demonstrated in this example, when new stakeholder groups are identified or new needs for existing stakeholder groups are identified through the strategic planning process, these findings are shared with the appropriate decision-making bodies on campus. These bodies then determine the impact and prioritization of the findings. These bodies also determine whether resources or actions should change, or if changes in the strategic priorities or the operational approach are required.

In the example given above, the development of the Courseview Campus came after the strategic planning process identified the burgeoning need for higher education in a neighboring county, and after extensive review of the data and deliberation by President’s Cabinet regarding the best approach for meeting that need. Additional information regarding the Courseview Campus can be found at http://www.sinclair.edu/courseview/

Within the past few years Sinclair has reaffirmed its commitment to meeting the needs of diverse stakeholder groups. One significant example is the revision of the Values, Citizenship, and Community General Education outcome into the Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship General Education outcome. The new version has sharpened the focus on participation in diverse communities, demonstrating respect and empathy for divergent worldviews, and engaging positively with cultural differences and conflicts.

In addition, in October 2015 Sinclair created a new AQIP Action Project, “Developing a Sustainable Structure to Support Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship”. Goals of this AQIP Action Project include the following:
- Development of a Sustainable Structure – implementation of an institutional-level structure that oversees proposal, initiation, coordination and monitoring of diversity efforts
- Faculty and Staff Development
- Promotion of Instructional Strategies for the Classroom
- Awareness of the New Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship General Education Outcome

There are a number of other initiatives underway at Sinclair to address 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. 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 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).

---

**Table 1: Globalizing Objectives and Results**

<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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine training service and program needs</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulation alignment</td>
<td>Advisory committee feedback, conversations with city/county leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor market analysis, regional census analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGs) Articulation agreements Curriculum pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Membership in regional higher education organizations (e.g., SOCHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators, Accreditors, and Government Agencies</td>
<td>Identify areas of institutional strength and weakness</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Higher Education data and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation processes and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need identification</td>
<td>Meetings with community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program/Course updating</td>
<td>Labor market analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job placement data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need identification</td>
<td>eAppraisal for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Performance Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.23** displays the Globalizing Objectives and Results that were specified as part of the International Education Strategic Plan.

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 (UAS) 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 Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) Training Center are examples that demonstrate the proactive steps that Sinclair takes identifying stakeholder groups and formulating strategies to accommodate their needs.

- **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 systems. In both cases there are processes in place to ensure communication of emerging needs throughout the hierarchy. 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 emerging standards. As well, during articulation agreement development with transfer institutions, the College receives valuable feedback about the expectations of a Sinclair student upon transferring to another institution. This information also guides curriculum development and revision. During the five-year Program Review meetings, departments provide evidence as to the currency and appropriateness of the curriculum to their stakeholder needs. The College also uses multiple regional and national data sources to predict labor market demands and guide program and course development.

State requirements must be taken into consideration during development and revision of curriculum. The Ohio Department of Higher Education publishes requirements for program approval at https://www.ohiohighered.org/academic-program-approval

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 online (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 an 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.

The College requires a solid rationale for all new program proposals at inception. 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 timeline of Program Review events for departments undergoing review during the 2016–17 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. Last revised in Spring 2016, 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).

- Assessment of general education and degree program outcomes. Each general education outcome and all of the program 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).

- 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important that the department develop a more complete understanding of why students are not completing the associate degree and explore strategies to improve acceptance of Sinclair courses by four year institutions.</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 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 courses above, thereby providing the student with two years of coursework accepted at the four year institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Investigate the need for developing a certificate program for those students who only want to enroll in a particular course and not seeking a degree. | In Progress | The accounting department has revamped its tax certificate to attract a new market. The revised tax certificate was implemented in the semester curriculum. We anticipate an increase in tax certificates for the following reasons.

- The federal government’s requirement for all tax preparers to be licensed by 2013.
- The new tax certificate is stackable allowing student to complete first and then complete the two year degree. |

### Figure 1.25 Example of Program Review Section on Outcome Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Outcomes</th>
<th>To which degree(s) is this program outcome related?</th>
<th>Year 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>2014-2015</td>
<td>RET 2204</td>
<td>All sophomores sit for and pass the mock NBRC Clinical Simulation Self-Assessment board examination in order to graduate. This examination consists of 22 patient simulations where the student must identify relevant problems with each patient. Approximately 30-40% of the class will require a second attempt but 100% of the class successfully passed the assessment the second time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values/Citizenship/Community</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>RET 2201</td>
<td>Sophomores are assessed with a rubric based on their performance as a mentor to the Freshman RET students. We begin the mentorship program with an annual “Meet &amp; Greet” provided by the faculty. Each freshman is paired with a sophomore that will serve as the mentor for one year and will become a “support system” for their freshman. A rubric is then used to evaluate how each student has engaged in ethical, personal and professional interactions. All RET graduates successfully passed this assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Outcomes

- Demonstrate the ability to comprehend apply and evaluate information relevant to the job description of an advanced respiratory care practitioner. | All RET Courses, CHE 111E, BIO 1107, MAT 1330 & HIM 1101 | 2014-2015 | Summative mock board examination for the certification and registry credentials | All students must pass the NBRC Mock Certification examination in order to graduate. On average, less than 10% of the sophomore classes will require repeat testing of knowledge. Following graduation, all 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 graduates have passed the actual National Board for Respiratory Care (NBRC) certification/therapist multiple choice board examination. |

- Perform all prescribed therapeutic modalities and diagnostic procedures relevant to the job description of advanced respiratory care practitioners. | RET 102, 1202, 1203, 1302, 2012, 2013, 2022, 2203 & 2204 | 2014-2015 | Successful demonstration/evaluation of each skill proficiency in the laboratory by a faculty member | 100% passed each laboratory skill/proficiency within the first three attempts and then successfully repeated the proficiency in the clinical setting. There is no limit to the number of attempts within the clinical setting. |
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
- The 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, with the following four sections:

- 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. The Program Review findings thus highlight curricular changes that should be explored, particularly in regard to courses and programs that may no longer be needed or appropriate.
- 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. In this way, Program Review findings from individual departments can identify needed institutional-level changes.

To track annual progress on issues identified in the Program Review, 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 comprised 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 from the reviews 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 Team meetings.

**1R3 What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution's diverse stakeholders?** The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 2015 and August 2016, Sinclair approved 109 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.
### Figure 1.27: Number of Recommendations from Review Teams Involving Program Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Departments Undergoing Program Review</th>
<th>Recommendations to Revise Program Outcomes, Credit Hour Totals, or Other Curriculum Aspects of Academic Programs</th>
<th>Recommendations to Explore New Courses or Programs</th>
<th>Recommendations to Study Viability of or to Discontinue Current Courses or 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>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1.28: New Programs Added Between August 2015 and August 2016

- (Data not provided)

### Figure 1.29: Deactivated Courses Between August 2015 and August 2016

- (Data not provided)

Figure 1.29 displays the deactivated courses and the rationale for each deactivation in Fall 2012. 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 was granted accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission in April 1970, and has always received reaffirmation of accreditation as scheduled since that time. Programs of study are approved by the Ohio Department of Higher Education. 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: [http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/accreditation/](http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/accreditation/). The reaffirmations and/or approvals received from the external reviewers supply evidence that graduates have acquired the requisite knowledge and skills expected in 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 Advisory Committee input for our technical programs, 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?

Sinclair will continue to monitor the need for programmatic and curricular changes via its already established processes. Because it involves a regular examination of program curricula, the Program Review process provides an excellent avenue for ensuring that curriculum is aligned with stakeholder needs, and the Annual Updates submitted in the intervening years between Program Review help keep departments focused on this goal. In addition, for many departments the external members of the Advisory Committees keep those departments abreast of emerging needs in the community. During an annual retreat each summer, the Divisional Assessment Coordinators meet with the Assistant Provost for Accreditation and Assessment to discuss results from Program Reviews and Annual Updates, and to determine whether any improvements to these processes need to be made. No major changes to these processes are planned at the present time.

1.4: ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUALITY

Academic Program Quality focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities, and locations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.A. and 4.A. in this section.

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.
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 http://www.sinclair.edu/academics/divisions/hs/test-for-essential-academic-skills-tesas/ 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/www/assets/File/Hom-Aca-AcaDiv-HS/HSApplicantPacket.pdf. 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 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/academics/all-programs/.

The curriculum information includes general course descriptions and detailed master syllabi so that students select courses that meet their educational goals. See https://catalog.sinclair.edu/ for course descriptions. Master syllabi for each Sinclair course has a master syllabus, developed by faculty, viewable online. Syllabi include the course description, credit hours, any prerequisite courses, 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 has developed an eSyllabus tool that creates a syllabus electronically by walking faculty through several 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 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 exam 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 – which are designated as "College Credit Plus" offerings in the state of Ohio – under the Vice President for School and Community Partnerships and the College Credit Plus office, and has recently substantially expanded the number of dual enrollment arrangements with area high schools. The College Credit Plus office 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). Sinclair has a recently established College Credit Plus Policy and Practice Council composed of representatives from the Provost’s Office, the College Credit Plus Office, Department Chairpersons Council, and Faculty Senate to discuss issues that arise in dual credit courses. One of the functions of this group is to ensure consistency of dual credit offerings with other College offerings in terms of curriculum, content, and expectations.

• 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 are seeking to receive 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/services/basics/academic-advising/prior-learning-assessment/advanced-placement-ap/.

• 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/services/basics/academic-advising/prior-learning-assessment/clep/.

• DANTES Subject Specific Test (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 http://www.sinclair.edu/services/basics/academic-advising/prior-learning-assessment/dantes/.

• 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/dspResults.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 http://www.sinclair.edu/services/basics/academic-advising/prior-learning-assessment/proficiency-testing/.

(2) “Credit for What You Know” Options

• ACE (American Council on Education) 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 and outside expertise 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.

• Military Credit Prospective and current students are encouraged to have their military transcripts sent to Sinclair for evaluation. All official military transcripts will be evaluated with the appropriate department chairs and equivalent credit will be added to student’s Sinclair transcript as transfer credit. 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
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• 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’s university, 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. More information on TAG courses can be found at https://www.ohiohighered.org/transfer/tag.

Additional information on articulation and transfer at Sinclair can be found at http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/articulation-transfer/ (addresses Core component 4.A.3).

• Selecting, implementing, and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.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 accreditation 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 38 specialized accreditations in its academic departments. A comprehensive list of these accreditations can be found at the following link: http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/accreditation/accrediting-agencies/.

• Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.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. Outcomes are reviewed by the deans, the Curriculum Review Committee and Provost's Office to ensure appropriateness to the program level, among other important factors referred to in section 1P2 (see section 1P2) (addresses Core component 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. However, it is not the only assessment means. 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 and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities.

Departments ensure the same level of achievement across all delivery modalities. Per Higher Learning Commission and Ohio Department of Higher Education 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, which holds
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.

What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:
- 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 98% of respondents expressing agreement across multiple years.

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 current students 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 most recent Employer Surveys with an aggregate score for five Employer Survey items related to graduate quality in terms of conceptual knowledge, technical knowledge, work quality, interpersonal skills, and critical thinking skills. For each year displayed there has been 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.ccsse.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.

14 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 Update processes. As noted in sections 111 and 112, these processes have been recently revised to improve monitoring of program quality, including requiring more specific information on goal achievement, specific reporting of progress in meeting review team recommendations, and general education and program outcomes assessment in the Program...
Review self-study. Current students, graduates, and employers of graduates generally indicate very positive feelings about their education experiences at Sinclair and program quality. Advisory committees keep Sinclair’s technical programs well advised of changes in industry that should inform changes in curriculum. Program improvement opportunities will continue to surface through the well-established processes designed for continuous quality improvement.

1.5: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Academic Integrity focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.D. and 2.E. in this section.

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 and provides the following definition (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.

The Faculty Handbook includes the 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which forms the basis of the Academic Freedom policy. 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 teaching and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)

Sinclair’s Student Code of Conduct Handbook (available online at http://www.sinclair.edu/www/assets/File/Student%20Code%20of%20Conduct%20Final%20Revision%202011-9-15.pdf) specifies the expectations regarding ethical behavior on the part of students. Figure 1.48 displays Sinclair’s Honor Code as contained in the Code of Conduct.

The Code of Conduct also lists 23 “Prohibited Behaviors.” Examples include:

- Disruption of, or interference with, any college activity.
- 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.
- Assault of any person
- Violation of a federal, state, or local criminal law
- Violation of the sexual harassment and sexual misconduct policy (addresses Core components 2.E.3).

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 are set forth in 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 duty.

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 the department chairperson, and if they are still not resolved to the division dean, and finally to the Provost’s Office if necessary. It should be noted that a new complaint process, as described in the aforementioned AQIP Action Project “Enhancing Student Complaint Processes”, is currently under development.

- 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 administration and faculty.

1R5 What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:
- 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

On the whole, the data would suggest that that faculty freedom of expression in teaching their subject matter is adequately protected by the current Academic Freedom policies at Sinclair. The Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) results 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 1.36.

Across these three administrations of PACE, ratings have increased for administrators, faculty, professional employees, and support employees, as can be seen in Figure 1.37. The most noteworthy increases across these years have been for faculty and support employees, who have experienced a greater positive change in ratings than the two other groups.

Student Conduct records track academic integrity concerns. Figure 1.38 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 1.38**

STUDENT CONDUCT CASES BY TYPE AND BY ACADEMIC YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Intervention Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman - Mediation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>630</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
<td><strong>412</strong></td>
<td><strong>472</strong></td>
<td><strong>488</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.39** displays the sanctions issued to students during each of the past four academic years. In each year for which data is available, Disciplinary Probation, Written Warning/Reprimand, and Formal Warning have been the most commonly used sanctions for students with conduct issues.

**Figure 1.40** Displays the information on charges and findings for AY 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16. The most recent years for which data is available. As can be seen, in the most recent academic year, the most common charges were disruption, sexual harassment/misconduct, harassment, and physical/verbal abuse.
In the 2016 Course Catalog, 47 courses directly address ethics and ethical behavior. Figure 1.41 lists these 47 courses, along with the number of students who have enrolled in these courses since the conversion to semesters in Fall 2012. These courses educate a substantial number of Sinclair's students on integrity and ethical behavior within their chosen area of study.

Based on 1R5, 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 nor systemic. Education of faculty regarding the rights and responsibilities surrounding academic freedom is ongoing. Pre-test data from the CTL Curriculum and Assessment workshop 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.

Results presented in Figure 1.39 suggest that 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, the current director has plans to improve the incident tracking uniformity, consistency, and dissemination practices, which will allow for better trend analysis across future 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. In the past few years the College has 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 commonly found at other institutions, such as the Bursar and Counseling Services. Unique to Sinclair, however, the College has tailored services to meet student needs – examples include the New Student Enrollment Center. In the various satisfaction surveys that Sinclair uses with students, 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. These grant-funded resources 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 2: MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

Category 2 focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of current and prospective students and other key stakeholders, such as alumni and community partners.

2.1: CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE STUDENT NEED

Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 3.D. in this section.

2P1 Describe the processes for serving the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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) (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

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 (see http://www.sinclair.edu/academics/k12/college-prep/office-of-college-readiness-centers/). The CCRCs are Sinclair sponsored classrooms located at seven select area high schools, with an on-site facilitator who works in partnership with the host high school to help students prepare for and successfully achieve their post-secondary goals. In addition to structured transitional support, students are provided with an individualized academic curriculum to help them improve their Reading, Writing and Math skills in preparation for college placement testing. These CCRCs provide self-paced, individualized computerized tutorials to help students strengthen math, English, and writing skills and thereby avoid placing into developmental coursework. The College administers pre-tests and post-tests to high school students to help ascertain preparedness for college level work, and these test results indicate that the CCRCs are effective.

For students who have graduated from high school, Sinclair offers a similar center on the Dayton Campus, the Academic Resource Center (ARC). Students who have placed into developmental coursework on Sinclair’s placement exams are referred to the ARC by the Testing Center or an Academic Advisor and provided with 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 for Developmental courses. See 2R1 for data regarding the impact of the CCRCs and ARCs.

In addition, Sinclair uses the Early Alert system in all developmental courses, ENG 1101, and several math courses to identify students who appear to be struggling, based on exhibition of one or more of the following behaviors:

- Never attended class
- Excessive absences
- Tardiness
- Academic concern
- Low homework/quiz scores
- Low exam scores
- Personal concerns

When faculty identify students with these challenges in their classes, 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 the student 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 funds 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 co-requisite 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 (see http://www.sinclair.edu/services/basics/academic-advising/my-academic-plan-map/). 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 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 do not 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 fulltime 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 fulltime 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 (see http://www.sinclair.edu/services/basics/academic-advising/). At the Academic Advising Center, students meet one-on-one with advisors to develop their MAPs, laying out the courses that they will take in future terms. Academic advisors provide

Within the past several years Sinclair has completed 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, has moved Sinclair toward a holistic advising model. The C4C model is displayed in Figure 2.2.

As part of the holistic advising aspect of C4C, six “Career Communities” have been developed, which are groups of related subject areas that advisors are assigned to, allowing them to focus their expertise in specific areas and thereby improve program specific information that is shared with students (see http://www.sinclair.edu/academics/career-communities/). The six “Career Communities” include

• Business & IT
• Creative Arts
• Liberal Arts & Social Sciences (LASS)
• Health Sciences
• Public Safety & Justice
• Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM)

The College assigns students to an academic advisor in each of these Career Communities based on their program of study. C4C goals include:
MEETING STUDENT AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

• 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
• Engaging students with faculty members, employers and peers with similar interests

Onboarding activities help build connections between the student and their Career Community. By way of example, when a student enters a Health Sciences program, the faculty coordinator for the Health Sciences Career Community enrolls them into the Career Community and contacts the student with directions on completing the orientation of the Career Community. In the case of Health Sciences, orientation consists of online orientation videos, culminating in a quiz where an 80% or higher score students are awarded a certificate that can be included in their admissions packet for their chosen program of study. These students are subsequently invited to all scheduled activities for the Health Sciences Career Community.

These efforts complement one of Sinclair's recently completed AQIP Action Projects, “Building a Holistic Advising System,” which identified and implemented 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 has been a major redesign of our support systems at Sinclair that revolve around academic advising, as described in the preceding paragraphs (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 into which they had previously tested (see http://www.sinclair.edu/academics/k12/community-outreach/academic-resource-center/). 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).

• Campus Ministry. The office of Campus Ministry is a multi-faith center for spiritual life that encourages interfaith dialogue and spiritual deepening. The Interfaith Campus Minister provides pastoral care

SINCLAIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE | JUNE 2017

and educational opportunities, and programs related to religious and spiritual life. Students, staff, faculty and administrators from all religious traditions and spiritual practices, as well as those who have no affiliation, are welcome to utilize the services of this office.

• Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The mission of the CTL (see http://ctl.sinclair.edu/) 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:

  o Classroom: Encouraging innovation, classroom research, best practices, and discipline-specific and multi-disciplinary interaction.
  o Community: Creating an opportunity for students, faculty, administration and the community to dialogue about teaching and learning.
  o Teaching assessment and peer review: Teaching assessment and peer review to aid in the continuing development of faculty.
  o Mentoring: Mentoring faculty to build learning communities and relationships between colleagues.
  o Resources: Providing resources to support teaching and learning strategies.
  o 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 (which includes participation in the Lilly International Conference on College Teaching), 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.

• Counseling Services. Counseling Services, staffed with licensed counselors, offers students free, confidential counseling to address and work on academic and personal concerns (see http://www.sinclair.edu/services/support/counseling-services/) (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 (see http://www.sinclair.edu/services/academic/tutoring-and-learning-center/) (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
Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

Sinclair closely monitors changes in the local economy and interpersonal skills. All student tutors must have a 3.0 GPA, earn an A or B in the classes tutored, and completed a comprehensive training program. Tutoring is available for most courses. If a tutor is not immediately available in a requested subject, a search for a new tutor will be initiated. To supplement the tutoring resources available to students, Sinclair has joined Ohio’s eTutoring, which provides free, professional online tutoring in writing, certain math subjects, accounting, biology, and chemistry. (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. Students and faculty with Internet access at home or work can connect to library resources at anytime, 24/7. In addition, because Sinclair is a member of OhioLINK, students can borrow items from colleges and universities across Ohio, either online or by visiting other campuses and using their Tartan Card. Additional information can be found at http://www.sinclair.edu/services/academic/library/ (addresses Core components 3.D.4 and 3.D.5).

- **Ombudsman.** The Ombudsman provides assistance to students who indicate they have problems, issues or concerns that need resolution. The office serves as a quick link for those needing immediate help. Students follow the process below to file an Ombudsman report:
  - Go to www.sinclair.edu/ombudsman
  - Click on Ombudsman Assistance Request Form
  - Complete and electronically submit the Ombudsman Assistance Form


- **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, with 160 supported this past year (addresses Core component 3.D.1). See http://www.sinclair.edu/services/support/student-support-services/ for additional information.

- **Tutorial Services.** Tutorial Services (http://www.sinclair.edu/services/academic/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. Tutoring is available for most courses. If a tutor is not immediately available in a requested subject, a search for a new tutor will be initiated. To supplement the tutoring resources available to students, Sinclair has joined Ohio’s eTutoring, which provides free, professional online tutoring in writing, certain math subjects, accounting, biology, and chemistry. (addresses Core component 3.D.1).

- **Veteran Services.** Veteran Services assists veterans and military family members with accessing and using VA education benefits. Veteran Services provides support for veterans both at Sinclair and with community partners.

In addition to the foregoing support services, Sinclair offers a number of academic labs where students can seek help with their coursework. Examples include the following:

- **The Mathematics Lab** (http://www.sinclair.edu/services/academic/mathematics-lab/)
- **The Physics Resource Lab** (http://www.sinclair.edu/services/academic/physics-resource-lab-prl/)
- **The Biology Self Instruction Service Lab** (B.I.O.S.I.S.) (http://www.sinclair.edu/services/academic/biosis/)
- **The Center for Applied Social Issues (CASI)** (https://www.sinclair.edu/academics/divisions/lcs/soc/)
- **The Chemistry Resource Center** (https://www.sinclair.edu/academics/divisions/sme/che/)
- **Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services**

Determination of new student groups who will be targeted for educational offerings and services occurs in weekly President's Cabinet meetings involving the top leadership at Sinclair. In these meetings, the Chief Academic Officer is able to share information gleaned from department Advisory Committee meetings and shared by chairpersons and deans. The Associate Provost for Completion regularly discusses completion initiatives at these meetings, which may involve discussion of new student groups and their unique needs. The Vice President for Enrollment Management & Student Affairs uses these meeting to discuss new enrollment initiatives and strategies. Identification of new groups occurs most frequently in these President's Cabinet meetings due to the responsibilities of the members of this group. Periodic regional needs analysis may identify underserved groups and suggest development of new off-campus sites and offerings. These occur every few years, although not on a scheduled basis. Senior leadership, deans, and department chairs have frequent contact with external stakeholders, including community leaders and local business owners, which often leads to the identification of opportunities or unmet needs. Sinclair closely monitors changes in the local economy as well as changes in state or federal regulations and
Meeting student and other key stakeholder needs

The course catalog (https://catalog.sinclair.edu/) through its website at www.sinclair.edu/services. Sinclair communicates available support services with ensuring all applicants considered for a position have the requisite qualifications. Non-academic support staff also benefit from the Staff Development and Innovation Committee (SDIC) opportunities described in Category 1 (addresses Core component 3.C.6).

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. Human Resources is charged with ensuring all applicants considered for a position have the requisite qualifications. Non-academic support staff also benefit from the Staff Development and Innovation Committee (SDIC) opportunities 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 its website at www.sinclair.edu/services. The course catalog (https://catalog.sinclair.edu/) contains a great deal of information on support services. Per the Sinclair Faculty Handbook, 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.”

Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs (3.D.2)

Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

Figure 1.22 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 via National Student Clearinghouse transfer data
• Tracking students who go directly into the workforce via Ohio Department of Job and Family Services employment data

Tool selection occurs via a two-step process: (1) In their regularly scheduled meetings, college decision makers such as President’s Cabinet or Provost’s Council 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, focus groups, regional market data, and student records. When the results warrant action, leaders charge existing committees or new project teams with the assignment, and the responsibility to report back results of actions taken. When data indicate that processes need to be adjusted or revised, the information is provided to affected departments for resolution. Action is prioritized based on its alignment with Sinclair’s strategic priorities and its likely impact on student learning. Advisory committees that are selected by – and work closely with – academic departments, along with labor market analyses, help the institution understand business and industry changes and anticipated program demand that will impact future student learning needs. Additionally, the Program Review findings described in Category 1 prompt departments to examine and reflect on student performance and perception information to inform curriculum revision and development.

The organizational unit responsible for that aspect of students’ educational experiences, and overseen by the appropriate vice president, assesses the degree to which students’ needs have been met. Many of our current completion initiatives have set goals for meeting students’ needs in concert with strategies to improve our ability to meet those needs.

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

The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

• 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 of information regarding whether Sinclair is meeting current and prospective students’ 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 online to a sample of Sinclair students every Fall term (and beginning recently, in Spring term). Figure 2.5 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. Note that the data in Figure 2.5, Figure 2.6, and Figure 2.7 directly addresses many of the processes described in 2P1, such as

• Friendliness and helpfulness of Sinclair staff
• Accuracy of information provided by Academic Advisors
• Availability of help from instructors
• Satisfactory answers to questions about programs, services, policies, procedures

The most recent administration of the Current Student Survey occurred in Fall 2015, with 719 respondents out of 5,050 invitations for a response rate of 14%.

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 2.8. The most recent administration of the Recent Graduate Survey was in 2015, with 287 responses to 3,400 invitations, for a response rate of 8% of graduates who were invited to participate.

An additional source of overall feedback regarding educational experiences at Sinclair comes from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). In recent years the number of CCSSE respondents for Sinclair has been remarkably consistent, with 855 responses to the 2014 administration and 850 responses to the 2016 administration (CCSSE does not provide response rates). Figure 2.9 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. In the most recent administration of the Employer Survey in 2015, there were 78 responses out of 236 invitations for a response rate of 33%. As can be seen in Figure 2.10, year after year employers rate their Sinclair graduate employees very positively.
PERCENT WHO PROVIDED RATINGS OF STRONGLY AGREE OR SOMEWHAT AGREE

<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>A variety of courses is offered at Sinclair</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<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>I am made to feel welcome at Sinclair</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>89.4%</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>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Courses are scheduled at convenient times</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Required courses are available when needed</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current Student Survey
Notes: Items are measured on a five-point scale: strongly agree, somewhat agree, neutral, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree.

PERCENTAGE IN AGREEMENT THAT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Sinclair staff are generally pleasant and helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Instructors are willing to help me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Academic counselors provide accurate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Students are willing to help each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Questions about programs, services, policies, and procedures have been answered to my satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>I don't usually get the “run-around” when looking for answers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current Student Survey
Notes: Items are measured on a six-point scale: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.

PERCENT WHO PROVIDED RATINGS OF STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, OR SOMEWHAT AGREE

<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>Quality</td>
<td>Sinclair provides a quality educational experience</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Instructors at Sinclair are very knowledgeable</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Sinclair faculty and staff are helpful and available</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current Student Survey
Notes: Scores of somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree are counted as ‘agreement.’

PERCENT WHO PROVIDED RATINGS OF STRONGLY AGREE OR SOMEWHAT AGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE OF</th>
<th>RATINGS ON</th>
<th>FALL 2012</th>
<th>SPRING 2013</th>
<th>FALL 2014</th>
<th>FALL 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>SCC staff are generally pleasant and helpful</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Instructors are willing to help me</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Academic counselors provide accurate information</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Instructors are available when needed</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Students are willing to help each other</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Questions about programs, services, policies, and procedures have been answered to my satisfaction</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>I don’t usually get the “run-around” when looking for answers</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Current Student Survey
Notes: Items are measured on a six-point scale: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.

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. The Academic Resource Center (ARC) and Career Resource Centers (CRCs) discussed in 2P1 are designed to provide assistance so that students are prepared to test out of developmental education coursework at Sinclair. Sinclair has data that demonstrates that more students qualify for...
college-level courses (and thus their need to enroll in developmental courses is diminished) after they have participated in these resources. Figure 2.11 compares placement test results for the 202 students served in the ARC in Fall 2016. As can be seen, many students who took advantage of the ARC benefited by testing out of developmental math coursework, with 41% of the 202 testing into college level math after participating in the ARC, as compared to only 14% prior to utilizing the services of the ARC.

Similarly, for English placement, prior to participating in the ARC none of these students had placed into college-level English, compared to 83% of them placing into college-level English after participating in the ARC.

For the 242 students participating in the Career Resource Centers (CCRCs) in local high schools, there were somewhat less dramatic but important gains through CCRC participation in terms of the percent testing out of developmental coursework and testing into college-level English, as can be seen in Figure 2.13.

Sinclair remains concerned about the success of at-risk students. However, there does appear to be cause for optimism in our work to help at-risk students become academically successful. Figure 2.14 displays course success rate (grades of D or better) trends for minority students at Sinclair, and indicates that success rates have been steadily rising in recent years. Note that while overall course success rates have improved, minority students have experienced greater improvement compared to overall students.

Similarly, course success has likewise improved for Pell-grant eligible students, as can be seen in Figure 2.15.

While it is true that course success has increased for all students at Sinclair, it is encouraging that some of our at-risk groups have also shown comparable improvement, and in the case of minority students greater improvement than students overall.

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

Sinclair has implemented a new initiative called Leveraging Information for Transformation (LiFT!). The purpose of LiFT! is to improve student success and completion by dramatically enhancing the availability of information and tools that can be used to guide and support individual students throughout their educational journey.
Through this initiative, Sinclair will:
- link and use multiple sources of student demographic and performance data to glean information that allows us to better understand and support each individual student’s needs
- place intuitive, easy-to-use tools, reflecting up-to-date student progress and risk information into the hands of those that directly support students
- meaningfully connect institutional actions, policy, and interventions to mitigate students’ risks and to best support their achievement
- see significant improvement in students’ success and completion as a result of this work and its synergy with other completion initiatives

Faculty began using LiFT! tools in a pilot in Fall 2015, with the extension of these tools to all faculty in Spring 2016. These tools allow faculty to continually monitor their students’ engagement with course material, other students, and the instructor, relative to their peers. The tools use engagement as a predictive indicator that is highly correlated with course success. Pairing engagement with other data available to instructors, including grades and student specific metrics, allows them to better target student outreach and support. These tools include a heat map to inform faculty early and throughout the term about student engagement levels and the connection between class engagement and successful course completion, enabling early triaging of students in need of support.

These faculty tools operate in tandem with advising tools that help academic advisors focus on the students who need the most help to continue on their path to a degree. These tools enable advisors to reach out to specific students at the correct time to help guide them in the right direction and drive re-enrollment rates. They also provide advisors with guidance on what intervention strategies are working at what point in time, and help highlight factors that are contributing to a student’s continuation probability, to provide context and possible points of conversation.

Assessment of the impact of LiFT! is ongoing - currently data are not yet available regarding its impact. There will be data to share regarding the effectiveness of this initiative in the next Systems Portfolio.

RETENTION, PERSISTENCE, AND COMPLETION

Retention, Persistence and Completion focuses on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion to stakeholders for decision making. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 4.C. in this section.

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:
- Collecting student retention, persistence, and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)
- Determining targets for student retention, persistence, and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)
- 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). Generally, about a third of Sinclair’s funding is derived from state subsidy. However, Sinclair has experienced a decade-long decrease in state funding for Sinclair, compounded by the fact that in 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 2.16.

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 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 an online tool called the Performance Based Funding
Dashboards which provide 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.

Grant reporting for Sinclair’s success initiatives requires a tremendous amount of data collection, analysis, and dissemination to the grant funders. The major initiatives overseen by Sinclair’s Completion Office are described in Figure 2.17, and are broadly categorized into four main areas: Connection, Entry and Engagement, Progress, and Completion. (addresses Core component 4.C.1)

### Connection

| High School and Community Partnerships | Sinclair has focused on helping recover high school dropouts, promoting college readiness, increasing the number of students earning college credit while still in high school, and streamlining developmental education pathways. |
| College Credits While in High School | College Credit Plus and Tech Prep initiatives allow students to earn college credit while still in high school. |
| Assessment and Placement | The College has been examining best practices in assessment and placement of students into English and Mathematics and has begun to consider high school grade point average as a factor in placing students in appropriate levels of college courses. The pilot was conducted using Tech Prep high school graduates who had a 3.0 high school grade point average or better. |
| Reducing Summer Melt | Sinclair recently won a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to partner with Georgia State University, Morehouse College, and Spelman College to develop a strategy to reduce the number of students who “melt” over the summer and fail to re-enroll for Fall term. |

### Entry and Engagement

| Career Communities | Career Communities have been developed to offer students targeted support based on their program of study. Every community has a steering committee composed of faculty, advisors, librarians, and student support personnel who collaborate to address the needs of students and help them develop a sense of belonging and solidify career goals as early as possible. |
| Career Connection | The Career Connection located at careerconnection.sinclair.edu offers a virtual career center for Sinclair, centrally housing career resources online. |
| Developmental Education | Sinclair has won an Ohio Department of Higher Education grant to partner with Wright State University to develop co-requisite remediation in Mathematics. In addition to the $20,000 provided by the grant, the college is leveraging funds from Completion by Design to improve completion of math sequences. |
| Integrated Advising | Career and academic advising have been consolidated into one department, as every advisor is building an active caseload of students. |
| Undecided Students | Sinclair is focusing on helping students who are uncertain of their career paths and majors. Beginning at their very first appointment, academic advisors ask students about their career plans and assess their level of certainty. Students are first placed into a career community where they can explore options within broad fields such as health sciences, STEM, liberal arts or business. If they are not able to choose a career community or need help narrowing their choices, they are invited to attend “Deciding Day,” an event that allows them to talk to faculty and staff in multiple fields to get more information and guidance. Students are given a short assessment about broad career areas and then are directed to recommended career community areas. |

### Progress

| Creating a Seamless Path to Success for All Students | Sinclair has been leveraging all areas of the college to remove barriers and create opportunities for all students to stay on the path to graduation. Faculty have reduced the number of credits needed for graduation in over half of the academic programs by an average of five credits, saving students both time and money. |
| Ohio Department of Education Innovation Grant Program | Sinclair has been awarded over $200,000 to work with Columbus State Community College to redesign administrative processes and create a comprehensive Guided Pathways Model. The model will better support course selection and program completion while reducing the number of excess credits students earn that do not apply to their postsecondary degrees and certificates. The project objectives are (1) to establish a mapping model for the redesign of guided pathways for students seeking two-year degrees and certificates and (2) develop a transfer model for guided pathways from two-year to four-year institutions. |
| Pathways 2.0 Micro-grants | The Pathways 2.0 mini-grants of up to $5,000 are being awarded to academic departments to meet specific needs of students in those programs. The objective of this grant is to fundamentally change the student experience in order to significantly increase student completion of credentials and close the achievement gap among diverse groups of students. |
| Brother-to-Brother | Sinclair’s Black Male Initiative aims to increase the success and completion rates of Black male students by building community, creating a sense of belonging, and by addressing the academic, social, emotional, spiritual, and financial needs of these young men. |
| Data Analytics | The college has launched a Leveraging Information for Transformation (LiFT!) initiative to develop a system for tracking student success data, predicting success, and building interventions to increase student completion. |

### Career

| Career Alignment | Sinclair is aligned to community needs, which are most prevalent in Healthcare, Advanced Manufacturing, Information Technology, and Logistics fields. Recent Sinclair students earning degrees and technical certificates have realized significant increases in their annual earnings upon graduation. |
| Refreshed Curriculum | Sinclair is at the cutting edge of emerging industries and is always refreshing its curriculum. Over the past two years, the faculty have developed three new degrees and 37 new certificates. |
| Seamless Transfer | Sinclair has 112 articulation agreements with 29 transfer institutions. The college has also expanded its Double Degree program with Wright State University, which offers seamless transfer of credits between Sinclair and Wright State and the ability for Sinclair students to live in Wright State dorms and access student services on both campuses. |
| Credential Attainment | In 2012, Sinclair set a goal of awarding 5,000 credentials by 2018, an increase of over 50%. |
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.

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 2.20 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).

### Table: Performance Based Funding Index for Ohio Community Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Draft FYIS 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>1,312</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>
Despite Sinclair's growth in state funding, it has been challenging to change the way that funding is allocated to the college. Ohio has reformed its funding system from a formula based on enrollment to one tied to institutional performance. This system incentivizes Sinclair to improve student success and completion, and to address significant access challenges for these students. These access categories who successfully achieve the course completion and completion milestone still maintaining a focus on success. An added weight will be applied for students within these social justice and access categories.

### Introduction to 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 year, Sinclair has made progress in increasing its share of available state funding, as indicated in Figure 2.19, which compares Ohio public community colleges in Performance Based funding from FY 2015, FY 2016, and FY 2017. While overall state Performance Based Funding to Ohio community colleges increased by 4.0% overall from FY 2015 to FY 2017, that increase was 5.9% for Sinclair, the fifth highest increase among Ohio community colleges. This demonstrates that Sinclair has a long-standing commitment to student success and completion, and data such as these have led to a dramatic increase in 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 2.20 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.

### Incentives for Improvement

- **Completion Milestones**: (25% of the FY 2015 allocation) - Successfully completed FTE course completions.
  - Transfer - 4-year institution with 12 credits: Number of students who successfully achieve the threshold of 12 credit hours of college level course work at that institution and subsequently enrolling for the first time at a four year college or university.
  - 24 Credit Hours - Number of students who achieve the threshold of earning their first 24 credit hours of college course work at that institution.
  - 36 Credit Hours - Number of students who achieve the threshold of earning their first 36 credit hours of college course work at that institution.

### Success Points

- **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.

- **Eligible Adult Education**: Adult: Age 25 or older at time of enrollment
- **Low-Income**: Pell eligible ever in college-career
- **Minority**: American Indian, Hispanic and African American

### Access Categories

- Minority: American Indian, Hispanic and African American
- Low-income: Pell eligible ever in college-career
- Adult: Age 25 or older at time of enrollment
- Low-income: Pell eligible ever in college-career
- Minority: American Indian, Hispanic and African American

---

### Table: Performance Based Funding Comparison FY 2015, FY 2016, and FY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY 2015 Formula Earnings (Excludes Bridge Funding)</th>
<th>FY 2016 Formula Earnings</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>FY 2017 Draft Final</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT TECH</td>
<td>$5,129,052</td>
<td>$5,036,546</td>
<td>-1.80%</td>
<td>$4,868,017</td>
<td>-3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL OHIO</td>
<td>$11,643,240</td>
<td>$12,247,178</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
<td>$13,110,638</td>
<td>7.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINCINNATI STATE</td>
<td>$28,392,404</td>
<td>$29,158,956</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>$29,531,874</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK STATE</td>
<td>$11,154,767</td>
<td>$11,987,351</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>$13,164,123</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBUS STATE</td>
<td>$61,150,177</td>
<td>$63,651,910</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>$67,039,588</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUYAHOGA</td>
<td>$63,733,701</td>
<td>$67,776,252</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
<td>$71,097,925</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN GATEWAY</td>
<td>$5,766,060</td>
<td>$6,412,549</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
<td>$6,768,894</td>
<td>19.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON STATE</td>
<td>$7,684,861</td>
<td>$7,907,607</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>$8,118,538</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>$13,302,962</td>
<td>$13,339,250</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>$13,512,224</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES RHODES ST.</td>
<td>$10,350,179</td>
<td>$10,576,993</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>$10,625,004</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKELAND</td>
<td>$18,594,461</td>
<td>$19,340,620</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>$19,611,309</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORAIN COUNTY</td>
<td>$24,541,622</td>
<td>$26,580,544</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td>$27,843,427</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION TECH</td>
<td>$6,713,619</td>
<td>$7,312,809</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>$7,319,687</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CENTRAL</td>
<td>$7,346,492</td>
<td>$7,589,367</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
<td>$7,682,431</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST STATE</td>
<td>$9,693,959</td>
<td>$10,173,627</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>$10,748,459</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWENS STATE</td>
<td>$30,562,911</td>
<td>$31,639,377</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>$31,884,220</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO GRANDE</td>
<td>$5,238,686</td>
<td>$5,710,586</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
<td>$6,174,110</td>
<td>8.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN STATE</td>
<td>$7,766,644</td>
<td>$7,863,945</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>$7,796,589</td>
<td>-0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARK STATE</td>
<td>$27,412,507</td>
<td>$28,636,108</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>$29,761,697</td>
<td>3.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRA STATE</td>
<td>$6,269,134</td>
<td>$6,539,909</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>$6,609,120</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON STATE</td>
<td>$5,430,116</td>
<td>$5,440,237</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>$5,390,555</td>
<td>-0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANE STATE</td>
<td>$8,307,840</td>
<td>$8,888,756</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>$8,942,175</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$419,101,428</td>
<td>$438,707,698</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>$456,256,006</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.19: Ohio State Share of Instructional Allocation for FY 2015 and FY 2016*

*Figure 2.20: Introduction to Performance Based Funding and the PBF Dashboard*
Figure 2.21 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 2.22 provides detailed data from the Dashboard on course completion at Sinclair over the past three fiscal years. Note the steady gains in state-wide performance comparison:

- **FY 2013-14**: Overall, Sinclair’s performance has been somewhat lower than the Statewide Completion Rate and the Ohio Peer Institution Completion Rate.
- **FY 2014-15**: Overall, Sinclair’s performance has been somewhat lower than the Statewide Completion Rate and the Ohio Peer Institution Completion Rate.
- **FY 2015-16**: Overall, Sinclair’s performance has been somewhat lower than the Statewide Completion Rate and the Ohio Peer Institution Completion Rate.

Figure 2.23 provides information on degree and certificate completion by access groups for Performance Based Funding from the past four fiscal years.

- **Students over 25**
- **Minority Students**
- **Pell-Eligible Students**
Further evidence that Sinclair is moving the needle with some at-risk groups comes from a recent analysis by Sinclair’s Completion Office that demonstrated that not only has there been more early student progress in degree programs overall, but also for minority students. Figure 2.25 shows the percentage of students who completed at least nine credit hours in their first year across the past five years, with disaggregated results for minorities and African-American males. The results are very encouraging in terms of increase in credit hour completion for minority students.

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 2.26 provides the available success rate information in the Top 45 courses by fiscal year (FY).
Sinclair also tracks degree and certificate completion closely. Figure 2.27 shows the number of Associate Degrees, Certificates, and Short-term Certificates completed at Sinclair since the 2000-01 fiscal year. Note that the increase in 2011-12 is due to a concerted effort by the College to get as many students as possible completed prior to the transition to semesters in Fall 2012. That push led to a decrease in the years following, and it is encouraging that we have been able to make progress in terms of the number of completions since that time.

Figure 2.28 helps illustrate the increase in degree and certificate completion that Sinclair has experienced since 2013, with an additional increase projected for the 2016-17 year. We attribute these increases to the many completion initiatives we have implemented in the years leading up to this increase.

While the IPEDs first-time full-time degree-seeking cohort completion numbers only represent a fraction of the students enrolled at Sinclair, the College is extremely encouraged by gains in the completion rate for the IPEDs cohort, as displayed in Figure 2.29.

Figure 2.30 compares Sinclair Associate Degree attainment with that of other State of Ohio community colleges. While many state community colleges experienced a decrease in the number of Associate Degrees awarded, Sinclair has the highest increase in the number of degrees and the fifth highest percent increase of all Ohio community colleges between 2015 and 2016.

In a year when most Ohio community colleges experienced a decrease in the total number of degrees and certificates awarded, Sinclair had both the largest numerical increase and the second largest percent increase.
In addition to data related to Performance Based Funding, Sinclair is closely monitoring data associated with the completion initiatives described in 2P2. Figure 2.32 displays several of these initiatives. Several of the initiatives mentioned in 2P2 are just being implemented, and data are not yet available.

### FIGURE 2.31
TOTAL DEGREES AND CREDENTIALS AWARDED AT OHIO COMMUNITY COLLEGES


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT TECH</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>36  3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL OHIO</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>-62 -9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINCINNATI STATE</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>-84 -5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark State</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>-68 -5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBUS STATE</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>4,753</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>5,744</td>
<td>153  2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUYAHOGA</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>-495 -11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN GATEWAY</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>-35 -7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON STATE</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>-37 -8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>-128 -13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES RHODES ST.</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>-24 -3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKELAND</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>447  34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORAIN COUNTY</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>-65 -2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Tech</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CENTRAL</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>-93 -20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST STATE</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>13 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWENS STATE</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>-3 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>13 5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINCLAIR</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>3,587</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>1,199 33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN STATE</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>-34 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARK STATE</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>139 7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRA STATE</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>285  -105 -26.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>457  24 5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANE STATE</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>491  41 9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 2.32
RESULTS FROM MAJOR INITIATIVES OVERSEEN BY SINCLAIR’S COMPLETION OFFICE

| CONNECTION | Sinclair’s Tech Prep program enrolled 15,321 students in high schools, and at other colleges in 2015-16. The 2015 high school graduating class earned 13,881 college credit hours while in high school. Tech Prep represented 8.0% of Sinclair’s 2015 graduating class, growing to 13.3% of the 2015-16 class.
| Entry and Engagement | Sinclair utilizes Boot Camps for Developmental courses which offer an intensive review of course content that allows students to complete a DEV Math course in one term. There was an 84% success rate in AY 2015-16 (~14% increase from AY 2014-15).
| Assessment and Placement | The 2015-16 students successfully completed 96% of their courses with a grade of A, B, C, or D.
| Developmental Education | The pilot of using multiple measures in place of placement testing involved 445 students where high school GPA and other multiple measures were used to place students. Students who were placed using this alternate method had significantly higher success rates than Tech Prep students who tested into college-level classes using traditional means, with an 8% success rate for ENG 110 and 74% success rate for MAT 1270 for students placed with multiple measures, compared to 57% and 42% respectively for those placed with the standard approach.
| Undecided Students | There have been 1,052 undecided students advised since this effort was first implemented in July 2015. There has been an over 250% increase in participation in student attendance at “Deciding Day” from March 2016 to October 2016.
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The largest percent increase in the number of degrees and certificates awarded, as can be seen in Figure 2.31, is in Undecided Students. There have been 1,052 undecided students advised since this effort was first implemented in July 2015. There has been an over 250% increase in participation in student attendance at “Deciding Day” from March 2016 to October 2016.
Credential Attainment

As noted in Figure 2.20, credential attainment has increased substantially over the past several years, from 3,357 in 2013, 3,423 in 2014, and 3,587 in 2015.

Seamless Transfer

There were 585 students in the Double Degree program with Wright State University in the Fall of 2016. In addition, there are currently 80 students who have applied to the University of Dayton academy. No data is yet available on outcomes.

Refreshed Curriculum

Faculty have reduced the number of credits needed for graduation in over half of the academic programs (48 programs) by an average of five credits, saving students both time and money. These programs collectively reduced credit hours by 257 from 3,283 to 3,026.

Career Alignment

Sinclair is aligned to community needs. Recent Sinclair students earning degrees and technical certificates have realized significant increases in their annual earnings upon graduation. Students' median salaries increased by 114% one year after graduation. For the 1,477 associate degree graduates from 2012-13, median pay before graduation was $17,300 compared to $37,400 after graduation.

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

There were a number of encouraging results presented in 2R2, and Sinclair is on the whole pleased with the progress that has been made. However, it is clear that much remains to be done. Over the next few years, Sinclair's Completion Office has targeted the following initiatives to further increase academic success and completion for our students:

- Launch new predictive analytics and course scheduling software to keep students on track to completion.
- Launch 15-month associate degrees to significantly cut time to completion, beginning January 2017.
- Expand Pathways 2.0 pilot to additional academic departments to create and track academic and nonacademic milestones within the program major.
- Increase focus on closing the attainment gap for students of color and low-income students through expansion of Brother-to-Brother and other equity initiatives.
- Re-structure summer schedule to increase enrollment and credit attainment. Within the full 12 week term, an 8 week term and two separate 4 week terms will also be offered.
- Expand the number of Competency-Based Education (CBE) programs Sinclair offers. Currently there are 8 programs offered in the CBE format, with an expansion to 10 in the upcoming Fall term. We plan to increase the number of CBE programs in the years to come.

Work on these initiatives has begun, although data are not yet available. For example, Summer schedule restructuring is underway, and is set for implementation in Summer 2017.

2.3: KEY STAKEHOLDER NEEDS

Key Stakeholder Needs focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups including alumni and community partners.

Describe the processes for serving the needs of key external stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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. Figure 1.22 in section 1P3 lists a number of nonstudent stakeholders with whom Sinclair has a long history of collaboration and partnerships. 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.

2R3 What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample
size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 2.33 displays results of these employer ratings between 2007 through 2015.

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 2.34 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 27% 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). A key indicator of whether Sinclair is meeting the needs of the community is passage of its levies. Figure 2.35 displays results of each of Sinclair’s levies since the first of 1966. Since that time, Sinclair has never lost a levy vote, which is one of the most important indications of the support of the community.

In January 2013 Sinclair commissioned the Community Leader Survey, which queried local community leaders on Sinclair’s effectiveness in a variety of areas. Figure 2.36 displays the results of the survey, which indicate that Sinclair is seen as effective by local leaders.

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

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. Figure 2.37 indicates that Sinclair has the lowest in-county tuition in the state of Ohio.
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 feedback regarding how well those needs are being met. This feedback is shared by Sinclair’s President to the rest of the College through regular Town Hall meetings and through annual State of the College addresses. Without question, the College consistently looks for improvement opportunities; many of those improvements currently center on the grant-funded completion initiatives previously described.

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.

COMPLAINT PROCESSES

Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key (nonemployee) stakeholder groups.

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students and stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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

Sinclair is currently in the midst of a major overhaul of its processes for collecting, analyzing, and responding to complaints from students or key stakeholder groups. In August 2015, the 2015 Systems Appraisal first alerted Sinclair that its existing complaint processes were not meeting standards required by HLC Criteria for Accreditation and Federal Compliance. One of the major suggestions for improvement in Sinclair’s 2015 Systems Appraisal was the development of a formal student complaint reporting process to ensure alignment with Federal Compliance Reporting requirements. This was listed as a Category Two Strategic Issue: “It is unclear whether a formal student complaint reporting process exists. The college may want to develop this to assist in meeting Federal Compliance Reporting Requirements.” The Systems Appraisal Team noted that “the College uses multiple methods for collecting complaint information from students” but that “the College may want to consider automating the process.

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.

SINCLAIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE | JUNE 2017 or using an existing ticketing system to track and categorize complaints.” The Team further noted that “multiple processes for complaints are identified across different units of the college, but there does not appear to be any coordination of these processes.” Given the importance of Federal Compliance Reporting requirements to institutional accreditation, Sinclair has chosen to prioritize the improvement of its student complaint processes, and moved quickly to address this deficiency. In September 2015 Sinclair initiated a new AQIP Action Project, “Enhancing Student Complaint Processes”.

Deliverables for the Action Project included the following (many of which have since been completed):

- Performing an inventory of existing student complaint processes. At the end of this part of the Action Project, a complete and comprehensive list of student complaint processes at Sinclair will be compiled.
- Benchmarking against other institutions’ complaint processes. Comparable peer institutions will be identified, and the result should be a list of no fewer than ten peer institutions with descriptions of their student complaint processes.
- Increasing web access to complaint processes. A clear, easily noticeable access point on the Sinclair website for submitting student complaints will be developed. Developing a structure for coordination of Sinclair complaint processes will occur. As a result of the Action Team’s work, Sinclair will be able to document that a central collection and coordination point exists for student complaints.
- Developing analysis and reporting capabilities for student complaints. As a result of the Action Team’s work, Sinclair will be able to document that is has analyzed and reported student complaints, and will be able to document trends.

Planning for this project was the focus of Sinclair’s participation in a Strategy Forum in April 2016. Completion of this project will occur well ahead of the February 2018 HLC Comprehensive Quality Review visit, and the goal is to have data to share regarding analysis and reporting of student complaints at that time. The AQIP Action Team on this project has worked closely with Faculty Senate, in addition to other areas on campus, in development of the complaint process. The new complaint process will substantially enhance existing complaint processes and procedures, and will provide the needed data to be able to respond to trends.

Under the current process (which will change upon implementation of the AQIP project outcomes), students submit complaints in a variety of ways, depending on the type of complaint and the related area of the College. For example, in certain 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 current 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,
4. Schedule an appointment with the Provost’s Office (Building 7 Room 7330) to discuss the problem.

The Student Code of Conduct Handbook provides the following additional instruction regarding issues involving disputed grades:

If a student has questions about a grade recorded for a course, he or she must discuss concerns with the instructor. Since grades are the responsibility of the instructor, generally only an instructor can change an earned grade. These changes must occur no later than two years following the term in which the grade was earned.

In some specific cases, the Academic Petitions Committee reviews student issues involving grades. The Academic Petitions Committee considers appeals from students to have a grade of “F” (failure) or “Z” (non-attendance) converted to a “W” (withdrawal) when emergency situations prevented students from withdrawing by the college’s deadline. After carefully considering documentation submitted by students and the recommendation of an Academic Advisor who has reviewed the case, the committee determines whether to approve changing F and Z grades to withdrawal status. The committee is chaired by the Provost’s designee and includes the Registrar and one faculty member from each academic division, selected by the Faculty Senate for staggered two-year terms. After the committee has made its decisions regarding each case, the Provost’s Office prepares a letter informing the student of the decision of the committee.

In cases where the student or stakeholder complaint received involves a safety concern, the College’s Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) process is applied. The Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) serves as a multidisciplinary consultation team organized to respond to student behaviors and concerns that may significantly affect the educational mission and/or operation of Sinclair Community College. The purpose of the group is to provide an immediate and effective response to serious student behavior concerns. The BIT Team provides multiple perspectives on any given student case. Behaviors warranting attention will be shared among the team at their regular meetings or, in acute cases, the team will meet as a result of a specific incident or series of incidents. BIT protocol is as follows:

1. BIT reviews cases (situations or incidents) of student behavior concerns that have been submitted 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 CARE team 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 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
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, although the new process being developed will provide online access for external complaints. On occasion, individual 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 1.22** 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?** The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- **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, a new complaint process is under development that will substantially improve Sinclair’s ability to analyze and report data on student and stakeholder complaints. In the meantime, 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. When the new process is implemented, there will be a single College-wide database housing all complaints. There are, however, various data points that currently provide some information on outcomes in responding to stakeholder complaints.

**Figure 2.38** 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.

**Figure 2.39** displays the number of complaints and **Figure 2.40** displays the nature of complaints received by the Ombudsman for the past five years. In recent years, only about a third of the complaints made to the Ombudsman have been academic in nature.
Based on 2R4, what improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

As was mentioned previously, Sinclair is currently working on development of a more comprehensive, centralized process for collection and analysis of complaints by students and other stakeholders. It is anticipated that very soon Sinclair will be able to provide data on academic complaints, student services complaints, Title IX complaints, complaints from community members, etc. and the resolution of those complaints. This will represent a major improvement in Sinclair’s approach to handling student complaints, and will bring us into compliance with HLC and federal expectations.

**BUILDING COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS**

Building Collaborations and Partnerships focuses on aligning, building, and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution.

Describe the processes for managing collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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 long-standing partnering with employers, clinical supervisors, and internship and coop 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. Sinclair’s website currently lists 111 ongoing articulation agreements with 18 different institutions (see [https://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/articulation-transfer/articulation-agreements/](https://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/articulation-transfer/articulation-agreements/)). 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 internships, co-op, clinical or capstone experiences are represented on the Sinclair’s “Find the need and endeavor to meet it” credo. Much of Sinclair’s work in developing the large number of partnerships and collaborations the institution enjoys is motivated by David Sinclair’s declaration: “Find the need and endeavor to meet it.” Figure 1.4 in 1P1 displayed the number of Service Learning partnerships for Sinclair, with substantial increases in the number of agencies Sinclair partners with since 2010. Other examples of partnerships and collaborations are listed in Figure 2.4.1.

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 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?** The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 2.41 provided descriptions of data that are routinely gathered regarding collaborative relationships with stakeholders. The following are 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 2.42 displays enrollment figures for Tech Prep.

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
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academic enriched support program to ensure their success. Figure 2.45 shows the most recently available outcome measures for the Ponitz Center.

Transfer Colleges and Universities Chosen by Sinclair Students: Figure 2.46 shows the number of degree-seeking Sinclair students transferring to the top eight four-year institutions. As shown below, Sinclair students transfer to Wright State University (WSU) most frequently.

Articulation and Transfer Advisory: Sinclair is an active participant on Ohio's Articulation and Transfer Advisory Council, which is overseen by the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). This group provides counsel to the ODHE 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 2.47, 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 2.48 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 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 2.49 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 2.49 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). Figure 2.50 lists the amount of money Sinclair has been awarded by grants over time.

During the four-year period from FY 2010 - 2014, Sinclair's Grants Office 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. In the past few years, these grant-funded initiatives have greatly expanded the number and scope of Sinclair’s major partnerships.

For example, 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.

Another example is the $12 million dollar Department of Labor TAACCCT grant called Accelerate IT at Sinclair, which funded Sinclair as the national lead with a consortium of higher education institutions including Broward College and Austin Community College implementing the competency based education (CBE) model in community colleges. Sinclair has since become the leader of CBE programs in the state of Ohio.

Furthermore, 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 each position. New Hire Orientation is provided to help new employees 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 Department of Higher Education credentialing requirements. Adherence to these requirements ensures that instructors at Sinclair are qualified in the eyes of regional accreditors, state education officials, and program accreditors where applicable.

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 (FPR) annually as a means of evaluating their performance in scholarship 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 and contribute to promotion and tenure decisions. In addition, Sinclair provides Merit Awards for faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching and other academic endeavors related to the College’s mission.

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 and staff that pays rich dividends while keeping faculty abreast of trends in higher education. The establishment and enhancement of the CTL is attributable to high 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 3: VALUING EMPLOYEES
Category 3 explores the institution’s commitment to the hiring, development and evaluation of faculty, staff and administrators.

3.1: HIRING

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. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. in this section.

3P1 Describe the process for hiring faculty, staff and administrators. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

• Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)

When a position becomes open or the need for a new position is identified, the following process is followed, whether the open position is for administration, professional level positions, or staff support services:

• The department involved initiates the request for the position to be either created or filled through Sinclair’s Office of Human Resources (HR) by submitting a Position Description Questionnaire through Forms Central, Sinclair’s electronic forms and workflow database

• Through the Forms Central workflow, the request must be approved by the department head, the next level supervisor and ultimately by the appropriate senior vice president

• HR representatives meet with the department manager and/or search committee to determine appropriate advertising venues, timelines, and the legal issues in hiring

• The request is submitted as a requisition via the On-Line Job Posting Site

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: https://jobs.sinclair.edu/. Any applicant applying for a posted position is required to create an account and answer general questions, which begins the screening process and deems the applicant suitable to move to the next phase of the process. Sinclair does utilize public forums to advertise open positions such as national publications local newspapers, minority publications, professional organizations, internet
web boards, and job fairs; however all applicants are required to apply through the https://jobs.sinclair.edu website to apply for a position at Sinclair.

The online application process initially screens applicants for minimum required skills, experiences, and credentials. Once appropriate applicants are identified, a search committee, comprised of individuals from different departments at Sinclair who are familiar with the position, receive training through Sinclair’s Office of Human Resources (HR) on college policy and procedure for searches. The search committee then selects and reviews all candidate application materials who meet minimum requirements. The committee then 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. The list of finalists is then forwarded to the hiring manager to complete the interviewing process. This hiring process is required for various leveled positions in the institution, including senior leadership, to allow search committees to make informed 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. All new hires have access to the intranet portal that provides access to resources such as emergency procedures, important phone numbers, FERPA, sexual harassment policy, grade posting policies, etc. Adjunct (part-time) faculty complete New Adjunct Faculty Orientation. There is also a mentoring program for all new adjuncts, and adjuncts teaching a particular course for the first time.

- 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 the Ohio Department of Higher Education Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review. In addition, many programs have program accreditations with faculty credentialing requirements. 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 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 abides by the Ohio Department of Higher Education's faculty credentialing requirements as set forth in the Ohio Department of Higher Education Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review (https://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 minimum of 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.

- Individuals who are making substantial progress toward meeting the faculty credentialing requirements and who are mentored by a faculty member who does meet the minimum credentialing requirements may serve as instructors while enrolled in a program to meet credentialing requirements. Examples of such individuals include graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), adjunct faculty members and dual enrollment faculty members.

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

Sinclair developed a “Tested Experience Policy” standardizing faculty credential requirements based on the HLC’s October 2015/March 2016 release of “Determining Qualified Faculty Through HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices” which provides guidelines to determine and evaluate faculty qualifications for HLC accredited institutions. Excerpts from that policy are provided in the following paragraphs:

**Sinclair Community College’s Tested Experience Policy**

The policy statement that follows represents Sinclair’s official criteria surrounding the use of Tested Experience to qualify faculty to teach non-general education courses, which are defined as courses that

- do not fulfill general education requirements in a program of study, and

- are used in programs that prepare students directly for a career.
The Chief Academic Officer has determined that the primary method of establishing faculty qualifications at Sinclair is to utilize the credentialing guidelines established by the Higher Learning Commission and the Ohio Department of Higher Education:

- Faculty teaching occupational courses designed to prepare students directly for a career are required to hold a degree at least one level above that of the program in which they are teaching.
- Faculty teaching general education courses or other non-occupational courses must hold a master's degree or higher in the discipline or subfield, or have a master's degree and a minimum of 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline or subfield in which they teach. Tested experience cannot be used to qualify faculty for general education or other non-occupational courses. General education courses are courses that fulfill general education requirements or are designed to be taken in university transfer courses of study.

For non-general education courses that prepare students directly for a career, both the HLC and the Ohio Department of Higher Education recognize that there are circumstances where experience other than the qualifications listed above may qualify faculty to teach college level occupational courses. The Tested Experience criteria that would qualify faculty to teach non-general education courses for Sinclair in lieu of qualifying via HLC-specified credentials are as follows:

- Minimum of an associate degree in the discipline, and
- Possession and maintenance of a widely accepted credential or certification that is the generally recognized industry standard (as determined by the department chairperson and approved by the division dean).

OR

- Minimum of an associate degree in the discipline, and
- Three years of experience in a field specifically related to the course to be taught (as determined by the department chairperson and approved by the division dean).

OR

- Minimum of an associate degree in the discipline, and
- Possession of a specific skill set (as determined by the department chairperson and approved by the division dean) in a field for which no widely accepted credential or certification exists.

OR

- Minimum of a bachelor's degree with related coursework/training (as determined by the department chairperson and approved by the division dean), and
- Five years of college or university teaching in a field specifically related to the course to be taught (as determined by the department chairperson and approved by the division dean).

OR

- Possession of an appropriate industry license, credential, or certification that qualifies the individual to teach the content (if there is no applicable license, credential, or certification in the content area, individuals may be qualified by completion of a formal assessment conducted by the department chair that is documented by the appropriate Sinclair form), and
- Five years of experience working in a field specifically related to the course to be taught and/or college or university teaching in a field specifically related to the course to be taught (as determined by the department chairperson and approved by the division dean), and
- In addition to the appropriate industry license, credential, or certification that qualifies the individual to teach the content and the years of experience requirements above, potential instructors attempting to qualify under those criteria also require review and approval by the chairperson, division dean, and the Provost's Office.

Sinclair ensures that all faculty meet the criteria cited above. 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. It should be noted that instructors in dual enrollment arrangements are generally held to the same standards, and must meet the same credentialing requirements as other faculty members as specified in the Guidelines and Procedures. However in November 2016 Sinclair received an extension until September 1, 2022 from the HLC to come into compliance with the revised Assumed Practice. Since that time, Sinclair has been working to develop and maintain a plan on file for each dual credit faculty member who still needs to meet the credential requirements by this date (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 institution-wide between full-time and adjunct faculty in terms of instructional payload hours for the past several years, with support from the Faculty Issues Team (FIT) and the Faculty Senate. As positions in an academic department come open, decisions regarding whether the position will be replaced are made in the context of this 50/50 ratio that has been agreed to by 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. 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

Within each department, 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, the Call Center, etc. In these situations, employees are hired and trained for a limited timeframe during which the need is greatest. In other areas, where demand for services remains less variable across the year, managers are responsible to ensure an appropriate number of staff are available to meet student needs. If more staff are needed requests for additional positions through the appropriate channels are made.

- Tracking outcomes/measure utilizing appropriate tools

Part of the strategy that Sinclair uses to track these outcomes and measures is an administration of the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) report every three to four years. PACE is an instrument developed by the National Initiative for Leader & Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE). Results from PACE that relate to the processes described in 3P1 are shared in 3R1.

What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring and orienting practices ensure effective provision for programs and services? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 noted above, the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) is used to track outcomes and measures related to the processes described in 3P1. PACE is administered online to employees at Sinclair every three to four years and was most recently administered in 2016. There were 812 of 3,375 Sinclair employees who responded to the survey in the most recent administration in 2016, for a response rate of 24.1%. 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 Sinclair mean ratings on this item across the past several administrations of PACE. Up until the most recent administration of PACE ratings on this item were trending upward, although the 2016 result is still higher than the results from the 2007 and 2010 administrations of PACE.

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. While there was a slight decrease in the 2016 results, respondents were still more likely to feel that workload is appropriate than was the case in 2007 and 2010, which would imply that respondents feel that sufficient employees exist to support the college’s programs in their area.

These survey results provide evidence that Sinclair employees feel 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. The results indicate that employees feel that both faculty and non-teaching personnel are meeting students’ needs. From 2007 to 2016, the survey results show continued growth in both areas which provides evidence that effective provision is being made by Sinclair for programs and services in terms of 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 of other institutions participating in PACE each year, 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 2010, 2013, and 2016 administrations of the survey on items related to perceptions of organizational culture, and demonstrates that
Sinclair’s results are consistently higher than the norm group (with the exception of ratings for Institutional Structure in 2010).

Similar to the norm group, the highest ratings were in the “Student Focus” area and the lowest ratings in “Institutional Structure”, indicating that Sinclair’s strengths and areas for improvement in its institutional environment are similar to its peers; although Sinclair’s scores trend higher than that of its peers. PACE results provide 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.

Figure 3.9 provides PACE results regarding perceptions of productivity and effectiveness, which further suggests that Sinclair is perceived by its employees to have had a supportive work environment over the past several years. Regardless of employee category, respondents gave particularly high ratings regarding their job being relevant to the institution’s mission and the extent to which the actions of the institution reflect its mission.

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, due in part to the College’s comprehensive 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 in 2012, 2013, and 2015. 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 provided incentive for some seasoned employees to retire at the end of the 2012 and 2013 Academic Years, with a similar effect in 2015. 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.

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 to four years to determine whether revisions to recruitment, hiring, and orientation practices are appropriate.

EVALUATION AND RECOGNITION

Evaluation and Recognition focuses on the assessment and recognition of faculty, staff and administrators’ contributions to the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. within this section.

Describe the 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 the following:

- 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.

Faculty evaluation

The Sinclair Faculty Handbook provides the following description of the process for evaluating full-time faculty performance via the Faculty/ Administrative Performance Review (FPR) process:

Evaluation of Faculty

It is the policy of the college to have a two-part faculty evaluation system: Part One, The Faculty Performance Review (FPR), which indicates a faculty member's level of performance 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 FPR is conducted by the chairperson or dean of the faculty member on a regular basis:

A Faculty Performance Review (FPR), 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 with each faculty member. The evaluator will be expected to prepare, prior to the evaluation meeting, evidence to support his/her expected rating of unsatisfactory or below expectations for each of the items deemed unsatisfactory or below expectations.

... The Overall Rating of the FPR will be a determinant for contract, tenure, promotion, and salary considerations. All faculty with a meets or exceeds expectations rating shall be recommended for the same increase in salary. All faculty with a below expectations or unsatisfactory rating will receive no increase in salary.

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

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

The schedule for administering FPRs differs between non-tenured and tenured faculty. Non-tenured faculty are formally evaluated once each year and tenured faculty are 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 FPR process. Figure 3.12 lists the six Critical Performance Areas (CPAs) related to faculty performance in the FPR 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, summer 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, the level in which they are hired, to Lecturer II status, which involves additional compensation. 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

Performance evaluations for non-faculty employees were temporarily put on hold in late 2015 after feedback from employees revealed concerns about the then-current system, the eAppraisal system. During 2016 a new system was developed, and in March of 2017 the Annual Full-time and Part-time Staff Performance Evaluation was introduced. Under the new system, employees and managers provide narrative and ratings evaluation in the following areas:

- **Section I: Job Accountabilities.** Summarize the performance of the job accountabilities based on the accountabilities listed in the Position Description Questionnaire. List main job accountabilities and evaluate performance over the past 12 months.

- **Section II: Core Competencies.** For each of the following categories, indicate whether the competency is a current strength or opportunity for improvement.
  - Personal Initiative/Accountability
  - Interpersonal Skills
  - Problem Solving

- **Section III: Performance Objectives or Goals for the 2017-18 Fiscal Year.** Identify two to three specific job related goals or objectives for the year ahead, including any completion dates.

- **Section IV: Training and Professional Development for the 2017-18 Fiscal Year.** Please identify two to three training and professional development activities in regards to additional/new skills recommended for the FY 2017-18 Fiscal Year which will assist in his or her development of enhancement of skills or competencies and to grow professionally.
On an annual basis, managers and employees will complete the form prior, then meet and discuss these different areas. Managers will provide feedback and discuss opportunities for improvement. These forms will be completed and submitted for the first time in May 2017.

- Establishing employee recognition, compensation, and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance
- Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

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 is not on a Faculty Improvement Plan (FIP) is eligible to apply for a Collegewide Merit Award. Each year the total number of Merit Awards is not to exceed 55% of the total number of faculty lines, which makes it truly a competitive reward. 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.

**Figure 3.14** displays key findings from the Faculty/Administrative Performance Review (FPR) each year. Figure 3.14 displays key findings from these reports for the past several years.

**Table: Faculty/Administrative Performance Review Results**

<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. As 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 |
| 2015 | • 310 FPR’s completed  
       • 182 formal reviews and 129 interim reviews  
       • One faculty member had an unsatisfactory review |
| 2016 | • 297 FPR’s completed  
       • 180 formal reviews and 117 interim reviews  
       • One faculty member had an unsatisfactory review |

**Figure 3.15** displays the number of full-time tenure track faculty members who received Merit Awards in the past five years.

**Table: Number of Faculty Receiving Merit Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Division Merit</th>
<th>Collegewide Merit</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PACE also provides feedback on performance evaluation processes at Sinclair. **Figure 3.16** displays ratings for the item “the extent to which I receive appropriate feedback for my work”, broken out by responses from administrative, faculty, professional, support employees, and staff. Note that in the 2016 administration of PACE the “Professional” and “Support” categories were collapsed into a single “Staff” category, which to some extent constrains historical comparisons for these groups. Historically, however, Administration ratings have tended to run higher than Faculty and Staff, although all responses have been well above 3 on the 5 point scale. Similar high ratings were given on identification of unacceptable behaviors across the four groups, as can be seen in **Figure 3.17**. Respondents expressed similarly high levels of agreement that employees receive timely feedback for their work, as evidenced in **Figure 3.18**.
The extremely high ratings for the item regarding the extent to which supervisors express confidence in employees’ work displayed in Figure 3.19 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 3.20.

Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

The current FPR process for evaluating faculty performance is relatively new. One recent change that was made in the FPR process is that an electronic, online process has replaced the historic submission of a hard-copy document. Sinclair’s Instructional Technology Department began working on the online system in early 2015, and it was first utilized as the formal FPR process in Fall 2015. Migrating to an electronic-based process has been more efficient and has generated cost savings with the elimination of printing hard-copy documents.
As noted, the new Annual Full-Time and Part-time Staff Performance Evaluation was announced in March 2017, with training occurring that month and into April, with the first year’s evaluations due for submission at the end of May 2017. For the next several years Sinclair will be assessing the success of this new staff evaluation system.

### 3.3 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 at the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 5.A. in this section.

Describe the processes for training, educating and supporting the professional development of employees. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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 of the college.

All regular, full-time Sinclair Community College faculty, administrative, professional, and support staff personnel may participate in the Tuition Reimbursement Program to enroll in courses at other institutions of higher education. Tuition reimbursement is provided to employees for the purpose of improving their self-development in recognition that a better educated workforce will assist the College in fulfilling its mission to provide quality education and training opportunities to the citizens of our community. Tuition reimbursement will be approved on a course-by-course basis for all job-related course work. Tuition reimbursement may also be approved for all course work leading to a degree that will directly enhance the employee’s potential to qualify for advancement within the College (addresses Core component 3.C.4).

Sinclair is fortunate to have an excellent Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) (http://ctl.sinclair.edu/) to provide professional development opportunities for both its faculty and staff. 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.

---
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In support of this mission, the CTL staff includes a Director, a full-time tenure track faculty member who receives release time to oversee the operations of the CTL and manage 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. This approach to succession planning was highly successful in terms of enabling a smooth transition.

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. The CTL provides a diverse array of on-going professional development for faculty in support of the Critical Performance Areas (CPAs), in addition to providing professional development for staff (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.
- **Overseeing 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 provides eligibility for adjunct faculty 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 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: http://ctl.sinclair.edu/professional-development/current-course-offerings/. 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 Brookfeld, Elizabeth Barkley, Ken Bain, Michael Teall, Todd Zakrjajsek, Karen Becker, and many others. These experts have shared best practices and inspired our faculty to continue to engage our students in the classroom. In addition to CTL offerings, once a year at Fall Conference full-time faculty have a day set aside for additional workshop experiences.

- **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 resemble taking a graduate course in teaching and learning. Each track consists of at least three two or three-hour workshops per term and are open to both faculty and staff. Professional Development Track offering include:

  - Student Engagement
  - Curriculum and Assessment
  - Mindfulness
  - Communication Across the Curriculum
  - Diversity and Inclusion
  - Integrating Technology
  - Office Tools for a Better Life

- **CTL funding opportunities for individual faculty 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, which includes training and support 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)**

The Staff Development and Innovation Committee (SDIC), composed of representatives from across the college, 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. Support staff participate regularly in professional development activities. Once example stems from the Financial Aid office where for the past several years, Sinclair has placed a considerable amount of time, effort, and resources into strengthening the Financial Aid office. As part of this effort, Financial Aid employees have spent an increased amount of time in training activities. **Figure 3.21 displays the training activities and number of Financial Aid employees who participated in 2015 and 2016 (addresses Core component 3.C.6).**

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 8 years the Director of Financial Aid has served on OASFAAs executive board, as co-chair, Treasurer, and most recently Vice President for Training.
• Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives
• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

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 Performance Review (FPR) 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 FPR 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 FPR 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).

What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

• 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 3.22 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. In this spike, faculty overtook administration as the group with the highest ratings on this item, and continued to have higher ratings than all other groups in 2016. This surge is attributable to increased professional development activities offered by the CTL for faculty during this timeframe.

In addition, each year the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) prepares an Annual Report of activities which is provided to the Provost’s Office. The most recently available report is for the 2014-15 year and contained the following data:

• 375 full-time faculty and 303 adjunct faculty participated in at least one CTL experience
• 104 staff and administrators participated in at least one CTL experience
• In all, faculty and staff participated in 2,332 distinct professional experiences
• 172 faculty and staff served on CTL committees, facilitated workshops, volunteered to assist in peer reviewing adjunct faculty, and other activities

Figure 3.23 displays the number of fulltime faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff and administration participating in CTL activities in the 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 academic years. The CTL collects feedback from faculty upon completion of its workshops. Figure 3.24 displays the results of this feedback from the past three years. For each question, 86% or higher of respondents expressed agreement that they actively participated, were introduced to new concepts, will be able to use knowledge to improve teaching, and with other positive aspects of their experience with the workshop. The workshops were highly rated for organization, quality, and engagement as well.

As a result of the Service Learning efforts overseen by the CTL, more students are experiencing and benefitting from the academic enrichment that comes from applying their classroom learning to real-world problems. Figure 3.25 displays the number of students participating in Service Learning across the past three years. Figure 3.26 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 also grown substantially.
### FIGURE 3.23
FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATING IN CTL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individuals</td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>individuals</td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>individuals</td>
<td>experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Administrative Employees</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>794</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>731</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,376</strong></td>
<td><strong>782</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,332</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 3.24
FACULTY FEEDBACK ON CTL WORKSHOPS 2013-14, 2014-15, AND 2015-16

| Questions                                                                 | 2013-2014 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I actively participated in this workshop.                                | 5         | 7        | 19       | 59       | 185      | 275      | 90%      |                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| I was introduced to new concepts or encouraged to see familiar concepts in a new way. | 0         | 2        | 12       | 65       | 199      | 278      | 95%      |                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| I will be able to use the knowledge I gained to improve my teaching.    | 2         | 2        | 17       | 59       | 194      | 274      | 92%      |                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Overall, this was an excellent workshop.                                | 1         | 0        | 12       | 62       | 1863     | 258      | 95%      |                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| The activities and other teaching techniques employed were engaging.    | 0         | 3        | 23       | 59       | 179      | 264      | 90%      |                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| The quality of the materials used was informative and will be useful in my classes. | 1         | 0        | 15       | 78       | 171      | 265      | 94%      |                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| The workshop was organized and presented well.                          | 1         | 1        | 9        | 57       | 211      | 279      | 96%      |                      |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |

### FIGURE 3.25
NUMBER OF SINCLAIR STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN SERVICE LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Series 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 3.26
FACULTY AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION IN SERVICE LEARNING BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

There are exemplary professional development opportunities for faculty and staff at Sinclair. The College will continue to work to promote participation in these opportunities. Since the last Systems Portfolio, the Center for Teaching and Learning successfully transitioned from the initial director to a new one and quality professional development offerings continue to be offered. There are no current improvements planned for professional development at Sinclair, other than to continue to monitor participation and feedback in ways that allow for continuous improvement, and those associated with the new non-faculty employee evaluation system that is currently being rolled out to Sinclair employees.
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 translate these high-level Core Strategies into specific strategic priorities annually. 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 “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. In addition, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) provides numerous opportunities for faculty growth and development, which can be used to meet Continuous Improvement Targets (CITs) in the annual Faculty Performance Review (FPR).

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 statement easily accessible through http://www.sinclair.edu/about/mission/. 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 (see https://catalog.sinclair.edu/).

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF PROCESSES FOR CATEGORY 4: INTEGRATED

STAGE IN SYSTEMS MATURITY OF RESULTS FOR CATEGORY 4: INTEGRATED

4.1: MISSION AND VISION
Mission and Vision focuses on how the institution develops, communicates and reviews its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.A., 1.B. and 1.D. within this section.

4P1 Describe the processes for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision and values, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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). See the Institutional Overview for the Mission Statement and Vision Statement.

Working in concert with the President and President’s Cabinet, the Board of Trustees sets the direction for the college in keeping with the mission, vision, values, and performance expectations 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. Periodically 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 set 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 (http://strategy.sinclair.edu/); 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.” It develops programs that support it. The strategic priorities that support it. 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 dialogue with external stakeholders, and other priorities that the institution is pursuing to fulfill its mission. Strategic priorities clearly identify the nature, scope, and intended
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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 Sinclair 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 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. Figure 4.2 illustrates the relationship between the mission statement, the Core Strategies, and the strategic priorities.

- Communicating the mission, vision and values (1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3) The mission statement is available on the Sinclair website at http://www.sinclair.edu/about/mission/. Core strategies listed in the previous section are available to the public on the President’s website at http://strategy.sinclair.edu/ (addresses Core component 1.B.1).

These two sources provide explication of the mission statement, in addition to the strategic priorities that support it. 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 dialogue with external stakeholders, and other priorities that the institution is pursuing to fulfill its mission. Strategic priorities clearly identify the nature, scope, and intended
The Process for Resource Allocation

Budget Managers enter budget requests into an online workflow process each year.

Deans/Directors and Vice Presidents approve or deny these requests for further consideration electronically via the online workflow process.

A team of College executive officers prioritize requests based on alignment with Sinclair mission and strategic priorities.

The team of executives recommends specific projects to be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final funding approval.

The Mission Statement is supported by the Core Strategies, which guide the development of annual Strategic Priorities.

- 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)

- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)

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, in ways that allow us to serve the public with the lowest tuition in the state of Ohio (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). Figure 4.3 displays the process whereby resource allocation is aligned with Sinclair’s mission and strategic priorities.

The College prioritizes budget requests with higher priority projects receiving approval to be included in the budget for the next fiscal year. In some cases, new initiatives will require that related budget requests are prioritized, as was the case for the Health Sciences strategy and the extensive building renovation that was associated with that initiative to create a state-of-the-art facility (see section 4I1). In tracking Sinclair’s success in developing, communicating, and reviewing its mission and vision, the primary tools utilized include the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) and surveys performed with the external community.
What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision and values? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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). PACE is administered online to employees at Sinclair every three to four years and was most recently administered in 2016. There were 812 of 3,375 Sinclair employees who responded to the survey in the most recent administration in 2016, for a response rate of 24.1%. PACE results are interpreted based on the following management style categorizations:

- Collaborative management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 4.0 and 5.0)
- Consultative management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 3.0 and 3.9)
- Competitive management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 2.0 and 2.9)
- Coercive management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 1.0 and 1.9)

Figure 4.4 provides a visual illustration of interpreting PACE results in terms of the four management style approaches. One of these items asks respondents to rate “the extent to which the actions of this institution reflect its mission.” Figure 4.5 displays these results, which achieved a remarkable degree of convergence for administrative, faculty, professional, and support respondents in 2016 relative to previous years. As noted in 3R1, in 2016 the “Professional” and “Support” categories were collapsed into a single “Staff” category. Responses by Administrators to this item were comparable to the previous three years, although there has been a considerable amount of fluctuation in Faculty responses to this item over the past several administrations of the survey. All responses for this item were at or close to the “Collaborative” range for all groups in 2016. Another item on PACE asks respondents to rate “the extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution’s mission.” Figure 4.6 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 according to PACE nomenclature.

Finally, PACE also asks employees to rate “the extent to which institution-wide policies guide my work.” Administration and staff respondents continued a steady increase in response ratings for this item across the administrations of PACE, although there was a slight decrease for this item among faculty respondents. Figure 4.7 provides evidence that institutional policies – aligned with the institutional mission by design – have an impact on the actual work of Sinclair employees. Again, responses for all groups were at or close to the “Collaborative” range.

Figure 4.8 displays the norm group comparisons for each of these three items from the 2016 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
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

4.11 Based on 4R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? Feedback from both Sinclair employees and area community leaders indicates that Sinclair’s activities are aligned with its mission and its strategic priorities. As part of the annual Fall Conference proceedings, the President’s presentation focuses on these priorities for the coming year. The priority initiatives provide a roadmap for progress on the core strategies, and include the following for the 2016–2017 year (see http://strategy.sinclair.edu/):

1. **College Credit Plus** (http://strategy.sinclair.edu/college-credit-plus/): Sinclair will help many more 7th – 12th grade students from low college-going communities attend — and succeed — in college before they finish high school, be a leader in this national movement, and enable high school students to become familiar with Sinclair so they have first-hand experience when deciding upon additional education post-high school.

2. **Health Sciences** (http://strategy.sinclair.edu/health-sciences/): Sinclair will provide state-of-the-art education opportunities for students pursuing careers in healthcare — and for the benefit of the community. In addition to classroom and faculty office space, the new facility will include state-of-the-art simulation areas, a home-care lab, expanded patient care facilities, convenient first floor patient access, a convening space to host large group college and community events, and a flexible space to accommodate future needs. The new facility will provide opportunities for inter-professional education and collaboration among different Health Sciences departments, as has been requested by our community partners and employers of our graduates in Health Sciences.

3. **Integrated Student Services** (http://strategy.sinclair.edu/integrated-student-services/): Sinclair has a long tradition of innovation and commitment to continuous improvement. Each generation of student services has improved and created a better student experience by building on the lessons learned from the previous generation. Generation 4 (G4) is the next stage in the evolution of student services. G4 will more intentionally address the academic, financial, personal, and career needs of our students. This comprehensive approach will lead to increased student success and completion, and will improve the student experience as it pertains to the enrollment process. Sinclair will leverage four main components to successfully integrate and implement the plan: technology, partners, facilities, and people.
4. **Unmanned Aerial Systems** ([http://strategy.sinclair.edu/unmanned-aerial-systems/](http://strategy.sinclair.edu/unmanned-aerial-systems/)): Sinclair has been at the forefront of the UAS training market and has had notable successes, including securing federal authorization to fly UAS, launching the UAS Training and Certification Center with custom curricula and simulation tools, and hosting and supporting a national UAS conference on Sinclair’s campus. To capitalize on the emerging market opportunity and build on the momentum Sinclair and the Dayton region have achieved to date, a solid and comprehensive business plan has been developed that supports Sinclair becoming a nationally recognized leader in UAS training, a phased implementation strategy for capitalizing on progress already made in this market, leveraging partnerships, and developing new industry-specific programming, and an alternative funding model that anticipates needed up-front investment, but leverages external financial resources, and becomes sustainable over time.

A possible process improvement might be to develop a schedule for regular replication of the 2006-2007 Program Alignment project described in section 4P1. In the decade since this effort, there has been no similar institution-wide effort to assess the functioning of all budget units. Sinclair could benefit from a periodic, regularly scheduled Program Alignment process.

In addition, while the Board of Trustees frequently discusses the relationship between the College’s Mission Statement and the initiatives that Sinclair pursues, currently there is no timeline for formal review of the Mission Statement. Sinclair may want to consider developing a formal timeline and structure for regular review of the Mission Statement by the Board of Trustees.

### 4.2: STRATEGIC PLANNING

Strategic Planning focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 5.B. and 5.C. in this section.

Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution’s plans and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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. 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 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. Figure 4.10 provides a visual representation of this process.

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. At the department level, many departments at Sinclair utilize Advisory Committees composed of representative external stakeholders for planning at the department level. 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. For example, external consultants were utilized extensively in the development of the Health Sciences strategy discussed in section 4I1 (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 annually – 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 align with Sinclair’s mission, vision, and values. This has been particularly true in the last several budget cycles 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. In recent years Sinclair established a committee composed of four senior level administrators who carefully reviewed vacant positions to determine whether the College should fill or reallocate the positions based on the extent to which they supported current strategic priorities. Based on the work of this committee, positions were 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 2017-18, currently vice presidents are seeking 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 efforts 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 5.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. For example, the College is currently consolidating four different tutoring service providers (Tutorial Services, the Tutoring and Learning Center, the Writing Lab, and the Math Center) into a single entity, reducing confusion regarding their roles and eliminating duplication of efforts. 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 countering 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, with increases in the number of completions and the IPEDs cohort completion rate. 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 2.11, Figure 2.12, 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 2P2). 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).

- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)

The primary mechanisms for tracking these outcomes are the institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that Sinclair has established that relate to strategic planning. Figure 4.11 displays the four Sinclair Core Strategies and how the KPIs are connected to them.

**4R2** What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution’s operational plans? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 4.12 provides both targets and results from the KPIs for 2015-16 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 4.12, 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) was above target in terms of degree completion rates, while the more inclusive CbD cohort’s rate was slightly below the target (over 22% of students are included in the CbD cohort for a given year). Certificate attainment rates were higher than target for the IPEDS group, and slightly below target for the CbD group. Overall student transfer rates were above target in terms of State Success Point 7 (students enrolling at a USO University main campus or branch after earning at least 15 college level credits at Sinclair).
The metrics reflecting transfer of CbD degree and certificate earners did not meet targets. 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 and the number of students moving from DEV to College level English within a year came in slightly above target. Sinclair’s three year course completion average was 72.3%, short of the 76.2% target (which was set by the statewide three year average completion rate). For all measures illustrated in Figure 4.12, the KPI rating came in at “good,” “very good,” or “excellent” for FY 2015-16. Four KPIs support “Sustainable.”

Figure 4.13 displays results for these KPIs for FY 2015-16. 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 4.4% Net Operating Budget Margin for FY 2015-16. 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 https://www.ohiohighered.org/campus-accountability). The State uses ratio accountability 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 2016 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. One KPI addresses regulatory approvals and accreditations, with no issues in these areas. For “Sustainable,” the FY 2015-16 KPI ratings came in at “very good,” or “excellent.”

Figure 4.14 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 2015-16 Target, showing “very good” or “excellent” 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 4.15. Sinclair’s market penetration rates (15–49 year olds) held steady. 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. Targets were not met for the Enrollment KPI, with the only “fair” rating of any of the KPIs. College Credit Plus was a new metric for which targets have not yet been established.
Based on 4R2, what process 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 2P2.

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 College Credit Plus, as mentioned previously several years ago 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 were consolidated under a new program called “College Credit Plus,” authorized in Ohio Revised Code 3365 and effective September 15, 2014 (see www.ohiohighered.org/college_credit_plus for additional details). Sinclair has adapted its high school initiatives to strengthen college-wide alignment with this new law (see http://www.sinclair.edu/academics/k12/college-credit-plus/), and has made College Credit Plus one of its strategic priorities (see http://strategy.sinclair.edu/college-credit-plus/).

4.3: LEADERSHIP

Leadership focuses on governance and leadership of the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.C. and 5.B. in this section.

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

- Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board 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 http://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, are appointed 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 which 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).
processes and practices. Sinclair’s President, Vice Presidents, Provost, and other administrative personnel conduct day-to-day operations of the institution without direct supervision by the Board of Trustees. The Board is not involved in decisions regarding curriculum. While it approves proposal of programs, new courses and programs are proposed, approved, and developed by faculty. In addition, per the Faculty Handbook, on some matters faculty policies require Faculty Senate approval in addition to Board of Trustees approval. Furthermore, the Board generally only has direct contact with the President. The Board does not directly contact college employees at the Vice President level and below.

Some of the planning that directs Sinclair’s operations for the year has its genesis with the Board working with the President and his Office, 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. To ensure alignment, the Board revisits these strategies throughout the year at the regular Board of Trustees meetings.

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 Spring
  - The President’s update each August to all employees at Fall Conference
  - Town Hall meetings the President schedules with the campus community monthly which all employees are encouraged to attend

- **Monthly Leadership Council meetings conducted by the President and attended by all college leaders at the director level and above**
- **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)**

A Board resolution from a few years ago at Sinclair provides 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 Trustees issued the resolution displayed in Figure 4.16. This resolution can be accessed online at www.sinclair.edu/about/board/resolutions/ under “2014 Board Resolutions”.

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 and the collaborative approach to maintaining them. 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 chief accountabilities 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 area 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, which include College Credit Plus (CCP), are designed to help middle and high school age students prepare for college and even 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 precollege educational opportunities, encourage students' personal growth and development and provide social, cultural and academic readiness activities.

- **The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)**: The CTL, described at length in section 3P3, provides professional development opportunities for both faculty and staff. The CTL does a superb job of building connections among internal stakeholders, while helping faculty, staff and students develop leadership skills and community connections via Service Learning.

Third, Sinclair utilizes a variety of advisory committees in many of its academic departments. 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 Excellence Award.** 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 employees 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 Grow Our Own Program.** The Grow Our Own Program is a faculty development program designed to offer candidates with certain academic credentials the opportunity to obtain teaching experience, while pursuing advanced academic studies within a prescribed and limited time period. Minorities and persons from economically disadvantaged backgrounds are encouraged to apply. Sinclair is committed to employing a diverse faculty reflective of the demographics of the student population we serve and believes the Grow Our Own Program will assist the college in fulfilling its mission. With special support, Sinclair has demonstrated that Grow Our Own faculty can grow, succeed and positively contribute to the academic and cultural environment of the Sinclair campus.

- **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.
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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.

- **The Sinclair Next Generation Leadership Academy.** The Sinclair Next Generation Leadership Academy was recently established, with the first cohort beginning the experience in January 2017. Employees with leadership potential are identified, and participate in monthly sessions for a year that provide intense review and discussion of important issues in higher education.

- **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)**

- **Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools**

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).
PLANNING AND LEADING

What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 4.17 displays remarkable improvement by the institution in this area, with ratings for the past two administrations substantially higher than was the case in the first PACE administration. 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 4.18 displays responses to the PACE ratings for the item “the extent to which administrative leadership is focused on meeting the needs of students.” Since 2010, ratings have been substantially higher for this item than they were in the 2004 and 2007 administrations of PACE. However, after consistent increases since 2007, there was a slight decrease from the 2013 PACE survey to the item “the extent to which information is shared within the institution,” as illustrated in Figure 4.19.

The College noted a similar slight decrease for the PACE item “the extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution.” Results are displayed in Figure 4.20. In Figures 4.19 and 4.20, while there was a decrease from 2013 for these items, scores remained above the results for the 2004 and 2007 administrations of PACE.

Two additional PACE items target the way that information is shared across the institution. Figure 4.21 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 somewhat improved over the past three administrations of PACE, as shown in Figure 4.22.

![Figure 4.22 PACE Rating of Receiving Information Related to My Work](image)

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 4.23 displays mean ratings for this item across all respondents. While some of the foregoing items are custom items for Sinclair on PACE where there are no benchmark comparisons, for several of the items comparisons to the Norm Base are provided. Figure 4.24 compares Sinclair performance to the Norm Base for the PACE items discussed in this section thus far for which there is comparison data.

![Figure 4.23 PACE Rating of Opportunity for Advancement](image)

![Figure 4.24 PACE Benchmark Data for Individual Items](image)
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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 4.25 provides the PACE summary data in each area for all employees.

![Figure 4.25 PACE Summary Scores](image)

There was a slight decrease from 2013 to 2016, but employees’ overall responses to PACE remained considerably higher than the 2004, 2007, and 2010 administrations of PACE.

As Figure 4.26 shows, the interpretation of these scores shows that Sinclair outperforms both the PACE norm base and other large 2-year institutions by a statistically significant margin. The PACE 2016 results reported in Figure 4.26 place Sinclair in or close to the desired Collaborative range in most areas according to the scale developed by PACE, with mean scores that are statistically significantly higher than those of both the Norm Base and large 2-year institutions overall.

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 4.27.

One final, and significant, indication of the quality of the leadership of the Board of Trustees and the President of Sinclair is that the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) awarded Sinclair the Exemplary CEO and Board Award of Excellence in April of 2014. Sinclair was only the second college to be so honored and was selected via a competitive process open to over 1,000 community colleges. The award recognizes “a community college whose Board of Trustees and CEO collaboration and working relationship
are exemplary in promoting effectiveness in community college governance.” Additional information regarding this prestigious award can be found at http://www.aacc.nche.edu/newsevents/Events/convention2/Awards/awardsofxcellence/Pages/2014_ExemplaryCEOBoardAwardee.aspx. This award provides further external evidence that Sinclair is fortunate to have strong leadership at the Board and Executive level.

Based on 4R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Sinclair is led by an award-winning Board of Trustees and CEO, who have a well-established relationship with the institution and solid processes and practices in place to ensure appropriate oversight without undue involvement in the day-to-day operations of the college. No changes to the Board of Trustees or the leadership structure of the college are planned in the coming years. One major change, however, is that there are now more opportunities for development and utilization of leadership skills among college 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.

4.4: Integrity

Integrity focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.A. and 2.B. in this section.

Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards and monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met. In addition, identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing and communicating standards
- Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution

Various handbooks hold the standards expected of Sinclair employees, guiding employee behavior and day-to-day decision making. The College maintains these handbooks, available to all employees, on Sinclair’s intranet including:

- 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, most recently revised in July 2016, 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 Faculty Handbook, with some sections subject to review by Legal Counsel and 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 offer shall review the Faculty Handbook at least annually
in order to keep current its policies, procedures, and general information.”

The Adjunct Faculty Handbook, which is revised annually, 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 December 2016. 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 December 2016, 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, 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. 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.

• 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. By way of example, to help guide employees in conducting college business in an ethical and legal manner, the following sections are examples of mandates that 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, examples of these policies include the following:

• Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy. The College prohibits sexual harassment and sexual misconduct. Sexual misconduct is a broad term that includes but is not limited to sexual assault, sexual exploitation, stalking, dating violence, and domestic violence. The College prohibits gender-based harassment, that includes but is not limited to acts of verbal, nonverbal, or physical aggression, intimidation, or hostility based on sex or sex stereotyping, even if those acts do not involve conduct of a sexual nature. The College also prohibits aiding
or facilitating the commission of a violation of this Policy and retaliation for making a complaint under this Policy. The College has a separate Consensual Relationship Policy, which generally prohibits consensual romantic and/or sexual relationships between employees and students and between supervisors and employees they supervise. Sinclair employees have taken the required Campus Clarity Title IX online training.

- **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.

- **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 anyone in the workplace. Employees should report any harassing act(s) or pattern of conduct to any of the following persons: his or her supervisor or the supervisor’s superior, the Director of Human Resources/Equal Opportunity Officer. Reports or complaints are thoroughly investigated in a timely manner and are treated with the greatest possible confidentiality. The College has a strong policy of non-retaliation against anyone filing a report or complaint.

- **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 (http://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, viewers may click on the “Academics” link in the webpage banner, and be taken to a page showing all academic programs along with links to the program description and curriculum (http://www.sinclair.edu/academics/all-programs/). The website provides hints that help students determine whether they might be interested in the program, as can be seen in **Figure 4.28**, 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, and potential students are informed of steps for enrollment at http://www.sinclair.edu/enroll/ (see Figure 4.29). 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/services/basics/bursar/current-tuition-cost-and-fee-schedule/). Figure 4.30 displays some of the tuition and fee information from the college’s website.

Sinclair also provides a Net Price Calculator (see www.sinclair.edu/enroll/finaid/net-price-calculator/) to help students calculate the costs of attending Sinclair. Figure 4.31 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 http://www.sinclair.edu/about/) (addresses Core component 2.B). On the left of this page is a link to “Consumer Information” (see http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/), which provides links to information on a number of topics, including:

- AQIP (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/academic-quality-improvement-program-aqip/)
- Accreditation (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/accreditation/)
- Acceptable Use of Information Technology (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/acceptable-use-of-information-technology-policy1/)
- Financial Resources (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/financial-resources/)
- Gainful Employment Disclosure (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/ge-disclosure/)
- Privacy Statement (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/privacy-statement/)
- Public Use of College Building and Grounds (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/public-use-of-college-buildings-and-grounds1/)
- Right to Know: Completion Rates (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/completion-rates/)
- Sinclair Organizational Chart (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/sinclair-organizational-chart1/)
- Title IX Information (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/title-ix/)
- Transfer and Articulation (http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/transfer-and-articulation/)

Figure 4.32 shows the HLC accreditation information displayed on Sinclair’s website (see http://www.sinclair.edu/about/consumer-info/accreditation/). This page also provides a link to a list of the associations, agencies, and/or governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the college’s programs.
What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 4.33 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 there have been statistically significant increases in the ratings for this item for every year since 2007. Section 4R3 reported PACE results for the item “the extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution”, and the generally high ratings provide 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
Based on 4R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Sinclair has explicit, well-established standards regarding integrity and ethical behavior that have been developed over many years, and communicated and codified in handbooks for the various employee groups. These standards apply across the board at the institution, and provide a solid framework that expects integrity among employees. Structures ensure that financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions operate with integrity. The college website provides a publicly available forum for communicating information regarding programs, requirements, cost, and other important information. No changes are currently planned for these processes, other than the ongoing maintenance and update of Sinclair handbooks and policy manuals.
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, but is in the process of being replaced by the newer, more sophisticated SAS Visual Analytics Portal. In both the DAWN Portal and the SAS Visual Analytics Portal, 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/SAS Visual Analytics 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.

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 seven 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 2016-17 investment of some $12 million dollars, indicating that the physical infrastructure of the college is well-resourced. In addition, 19 full-time sworn 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
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.

5P1 Describe the processes for knowledge management, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

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 for a decade it was the primary delivery mechanism of institutional data to end-users. The DAWN Portal revolutionized the way data was shared at Sinclair, and replaced the previous heavy reliance on e-mailed reports. For the first time, end users were able to access data on demand, rather than requesting it from RAR employees, who were at times unable to respond as quickly as they would like due to time and resources constraints. The DAWN Portal was a huge success in terms of increasing access to, use of, and reliance on data in decision making.

However, users noted some challenges in using the DAWN Portal reports. As technology became more advanced over the years, the time it took the reports to run began to seem slow compared to other activities people typically engage in on the internet. The format of these reports was frequently clunky, and sometimes confusing due to the structure of the SAS reporting tools that powered the DAWN Portal. Over a decade, there was a proliferation of reports that had been developed, which frequently confused users as to which reports they should be using for which data needs. With user feedback regarding these issues, it became apparent that it was time for an upgrade to the College’s online data reporting systems.

Beginning in 2015, DAWN reports began being gradually replaced by reports in the new SAS Visual Analytics Portal, a newer, faster, more sophisticated tool for dissemination of data. Currently Sinclair is in a period of transition between these two data sources, and eventually all portal reporting capability will be served through the SAS Visual Analytics Portal. Each evening the data warehouse underlying both DAWN and Visual Analytics captures student records from Colleague (the College’s Enterprise Resource Planning system) for future access by users. Both portals run on the SAS Institute (SAS) business intelligence architecture, and empower 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 both DAWN and Visual Analytics 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.

Both the DAWN Portal and Visual Analytics are accessed through the College’s intranet and require 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 these portals, users select from a number of tabs organizing reports into different areas.

Some of the most frequently used reports were the first to be migrated from the DAWN Portal to the SAS Visual Analytics portal, including the following reports:

**Performance Based Funding (PBF) Dashboard (see 2P2 and 2R2):** This series of dashboards is specifically oriented around the PBF metrics. There are tabs for each PBF metric:
- PBF – Subsidy Eligible Course Completion – Overall
- PBF - Subsidy Eligible Course Completion – Department Drilldown
- PBF - Subsidy Eligible Course Completion – At Risk Groups
- PBF - Completion Milestones

**Average Class Size – Analysis Tool:** Provides current Average Class Size with the following tabs:
- Overall Average Class Size
- ACS Analysis Tool – Chair (allows chairs to see the impact of enrollment management decisions on average class size in their budget code)
- ACS Analysis Tool – Dean (allows deans to see the impact of enrollment management decisions on average class size in their division)
- ACS Analysis Tool – Site (allows administrators to see the impact of enrollment management decisions on average class size at different locations)

**Faculty Ratio Report:** Allows users to select a division and/or department and see the Full-time/Part-time Ratio for Fall, Spring, and the fiscal year overall.

**Advising Case Management Tool:** Helps advisors to identify specific groups of degree-seeking students which will help them better manage the students in their case load. After selecting filters of interest, the report displays a list of students who meet the criteria that are specified in the filters.

**Employee Payroll Report:** Provides budget managers information on
- Overall Count and Pay
- Employee Demographics
- Employee Turnover
- Compensation
- Comparison Detail

**General Ledger and Hourly Employee Report:** These reports are designed to surface current and historical financial data related to the General Ledger and Hourly Employees, and contains the following tabs:
- Non-Personnel Items – Executive
- Non-Personnel Items – Department Manager
- Non-Personnel Items – Trend
- Hourly Human Assets
Grants Accounting General Ledger Activity Report: Allows budget managers to see General Ledger Activity for their budget code.

Grants Accounting Payroll Report: Allow budget managers to see payroll information for their budget code.

Course Success Dashboard: The course success section of the dashboard provides information about course success, failure, and withdrawal by academic division, department, and course. The Success Rate by Student Program section of the dashboard shows course success information for students who have declared a particular program.

Degree Audit Analysis Tool: Provides information about students’ declared programs and the courses that they have taken that can be applied toward these programs. Also summarizes student progress toward program completion.

Degree Fact Dashboard: Contains the following tabs:
- Student Credential – This section provides number of graduates in each program by Academic or Fiscal Year.
- GraduateDetail – Provides detail information about graduates. Information includes Subsequent Enrollment status from National Clearing House (NSC) data and employment data from Ohio Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) records.
- Credential by Subgroups – Provides information about the number, gender, subsequent enrollment, and minority status of students graduating from selected program(s).

Daily Enrollment Report: Provides non-official daily comparative enrollments for headcount, term Full-Time Equivalents (FTE), and tuition and fees.

Enrollment Trend: The Enrollment Trend tool presents enrollment records at 14th census day after term start and 30th census day after term end. Enrollment records are presented using course count, term Full-Time Equivalents (FTE), and Annualized FTE values.

Pre-College Reporting Tool: Provides current and historical data on aggregate and student-level enrollment in College Credit Plus and other credit-bearing pre-college programs.

Student Program Dashboard: The Student Program Dashboard is designed to provide student-level information about activity in selected programs of study.
- The Student Program By Term section provides information about students’ enrollment in selected program(s) by year(s) or term(s).
- The Student Program Requirement Check section allows users to determine whether students who are currently attached to a selected program of study have satisfied core program course requirements as defined in the Course Management Tool (CMT).

Subsequent Enrollment: Consists of two tabs:
- Subsequent Enrollment Tab shows the total headcount and percentage of students who were subsequently enrolled at other institutions after leaving Sinclair. This can be filtered in two ways: by the students’ Sinclair division, department, or program or by the students’ subsequent enrollment destination.
- Enrolled College Detail Tab shows the top ten colleges or universities where Sinclair students subsequently enrolled. This tab can also be filtered by the students’ Sinclair division, department or program.

Nursing Students Performance: Presents Graduation and Test scores for nursing student cohort starting from the academic year 2001-01 to the present.

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, a standard which is now enhanced by the advances of the SAS Visual Analytics Portal. Security is in place to ensure that information is only shared with those college employees for whom it is appropriate as individuals change positions at Sinclair, security settings for these individuals are revised accordingly. 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.

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” in SAS Visual Analytics, but worked closely with the Provost’s Office in developing the tool and the various components that were included in it.

RAR personnel are invited to Provost’s Council several times a year, where they discuss different aspects of these various reports with leadership in Instruction, and receive feedback and suggestions for increasing the value for end users. During these meetings they present new reports that are under development, and request suggestions for making them more useful to end users. RAR then adjusts the reports based on this feedback they receive. 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. RAR provides monthly training sessions open to all employees on the use of SAS Visual Analytics.
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? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 and SAS Visual Analytics portals are the primary providers of institutional data to decision makers at the institution. RAR has indicated that over 2,000 unique users have logged into the DAWN Portal and/or SAS Visual Analytics, which indicates a substantial number of Sinclair employees have accessed information through these sources. There is no question that over the past decade RAR 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 (see 3R1 for details regarding sample size and response rate for the most recent administration of PACE). The increases (statistically significant between 2010 and 2013) seen in recent years are attributable to the increased use of the DAWN Portal, although there was a slight decrease between 2013 and 2016, possibly related to the transition period between the DAWN Portal and the SAS Visual Analytics Portal, and currently having two sources of information that may be confusing to users.

Figure 5.2 breaks this information down by employee group (administration, faculty, professional, and support). As noted in 3R1, in 2016 the “Professional” and “Support” categories were collapsed into a single “Staff” category in the 2016 administration of PACE. 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. Unfortunately, while administration ratings remained high, faculty ratings decreased from 2013 to 2016 after an increase between 2010 and 2013, which may indicate that ground has been lost with faculty and there may be a need to reach out to faculty with additional training opportunities for using the newer SAS Visual Analytics Portal.

Figure 5.3 demonstrates that the ratings for Sinclair on this item are statistically significantly higher than that of the PACE Norm Base.

Similarly, PACE respondents were asked to rate “the extent to which I receive information related to my work.” Figure 5.4 shows overall mean ratings for this item across the years - note that after an increase in mean ratings between 2010 and 2013, ratings returned to the 2010 level for 2016. 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 5.5.

These results provide evidence that data are shared to a greater extent than was the case in 2007 prior to the launch of the DAWN Portal, and that employees feel more strongly that useful information is shared with them.
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 5.6 (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.

**Figure 5.4**
PACE Rating of Receiving Information Related to Work – All Respondents

**Figure 5.5**
PACE Rating of Information Useful to Work – All Respondents

**Figure 5.6**
PACE Rating of Use of Data in Decision Making and Assessment Occurs
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511 > Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Compared to the 2007 administration of PACE, subsequent ratings have increased for PACE items involving (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) reporting that they use data to a greater extent in decision making and assessment. This increase can be attributed, at least in part, to increased 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, two years ago Sinclair implemented a new platform for disseminating data to the campus, the SAS Visual Analytics tool. Many of the reports from the DAWN Portal are also available in SAS Visual Analytics, and the plan is to eventually have SAS Visual Analytics fully replace the DAWN Portal. Sinclair is currently running both portals simultaneously, which may be confusing to users. In addition, decreases in ratings from 2013 to 2016 for PACE ratings of items involving access to data and use of data likely signal a need for additional training on the newer portal. The relatively larger decreases in ratings for faculty in particular point to a need for faculty training on using the Visual Analytics portal. Reliance on Visual Analytics reports will likely increase, thus additional training of end users will be required over the next several years.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P2 > Describe the processes for managing resources, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

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 120 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 5.7** displays Sinclair’s revenue sources, along with the percent of total revenue each accounted for from FY 2001 through FY 2017. Except for a relatively small percent of revenue, Sinclair is reliant on credit student fees, county levy, and state appropriations as revenue sources. **Figure 5.7** tells an interesting story, however – in FY 2001 state appropriations accounted for almost half of all revenue, but by FY 2017 it had fallen to 34%, with an associated rise in the percent of revenue from credit student fees.

**Figure 5.8** is from the Budget Book, and details the operating expenditures by category for FY 2017. As can be seen, the category with by far the largest expenditures is Instruction, with 54% of the operating budget, followed by Student Support at 13%, Institutional Support at 13%, and Academic Support at 10%, with the remaining 10% accounted for by Plant Operations and Maintenance. Together Instruction, Student Support, and Academic Support account for over 77% of expenditures (addresses Core component 5.A.2). These percentages have remained very consistent over the past several years.

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 2016, among Ohio two-year institutions of higher education in the University System of Ohio (USO), Sinclair tied for the second highest 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 (see [https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/financial/campus-accountability/FY2016_TABLE1_FIN-RATIOS_Excluding-GASB68.pdf](https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/financial/campus-accountability/FY2016_TABLE1_FIN-RATIOS_Excluding-GASB68.pdf)). 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 5.10** in section 5R2 (addresses Core component 5.A.1).

The Budget Book also provides an analysis of factors that will impact revenue in the coming fiscal year, helping ensure that Sinclair will have sufficient resources to meet its strategic goals (addresses Core component 5.A.3). According to this analysis, key factors that will drive the college’s results in FY 2017 are as follows:

1. **Student enrollment**: The FY 2017 budget envisions a halt to the decline in enrollment that has occurred over the past two years.
2. **Property values**: For the first time since 2008, it appears that property tax valuation in Montgomery County will hold steady as opposed
to deteriorating. This is especially important as the combined proceeds from the college’s two levies will constitute the greatest share of operating budget revenues (26.6%) in the last 25 years.

3. Performance-based funding (PBF): State subsidy flowing to the college via the PBF formula is projected to comprise 34.5% of the college’s revenue pool in FY 2017. The share of total revenues comprised by SSI in FY 2016 and FY 2017 is at its highest point since FY 2011.

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 Core Strategies, 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 Technology evaluate 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.

Figure 5.9 provides a visual illustration of this process.

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, 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.
What are the results for resource management? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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

**Figure 5.10** displays the revenues and expenses per FTE since FY 2001 (in 2017 dollars). Revenues have consistently outpaced expenditures at Sinclair, with the exception of FY 2004.

Evidence for Sinclair’s solid financial health is provided by data from the Ohio Department of Higher Education as calculated pursuant to the Campus Financial Accountability standards promulgated by Senate Bill 6 of the 122nd General Assembly of the State of Ohio. Sinclair’s composite score of 4.8 was well above the Ohio average of 3.8 for FY 2016, and was tied for second highest in the state among Ohio Community Colleges (see https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/financial/campus-accountability/FY2016_TABLE1_FIN-RATIOS_Excluding-GASB68.pdf).

Sinclair has managed to maintain this 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 5.12**.

**Figure 5.13** displays historic information on expenditures by percent of total from FY 2001 through FY 2017. 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.

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 5.14** displays trends in the ratio of full-time to part-time instructors for the past several years. As can be seen, the College has been having challenges achieving the 50/50 ratio since 2014.

To efficiently manage instructional staffing costs, the College consistently challenges itself to attain and improve upon its Average Class Size (ACS) metric. **Figure 5.15** displays the trend in average class size. 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 5I2, will drive decision making to reduce the number of low enrollment sections and further boost class size efficiency.

**Based on 5R2, what process 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. It will also be important to work to improve alignment with the targeted 50/50 ratio between full-time and part-time faculty hours.
To this end, Sinclair developed new online tools to assist chairs in building course schedules and managing enrollment. The Average Class Size tool is an example of this, which was described in detail in section 5P1. It is hoped that the Average Class Size tool will help chairs 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 trends. Other tools used to manage efficiencies in Instruction include the Faculty Ratio Report, the Employee Payroll Report, General Ledger and Hourly Employee Report. As with the Average Class Size tool, Sinclair will need to do additional training with these reports and analyze whether they are actually having an impact on intended outcomes in the next couple of years.

5P3 Describe the processes for operational effectiveness, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals

Section 5P2 described the Budget Book and the process of building the overall budget for the college, where monitoring revenues and expenditures plays a key role in the development of the budget as a whole. The preparation for the annual budget is a coordinated process that builds budgets with strong alignment to institutional goals.

Sinclair’s budget process begins in the late fall with the development of enrollment targets for the college based on trend analysis of historical patterns of enrollment and other variables. These targets drive a significant portion of the college’s expected revenues (and therefore expenses) and are communicated downward through the organization from the President’s Cabinet to first level budget managers, including academic department chairs, through the respective vice presidents (and their subordinate budget managers as those vice presidents deem prudent) to re-prioritize budgets to meet changing needs. Typically resources are also set aside to fund strategic initiatives that show promise in meeting the college’s educational priorities.

Budget managers at all levels of the organization can call upon the Office of Budget and Analysis (OBA) and the Department of Research, Analytics and Reporting (RAR) for analytical assistance in meeting the budget targets assigned to them via their reporting hierarchy as described above. This
support ranges from the self-service tools of the web portal (whereby users can answer their own questions) to discrete research efforts on the part of OBA and/or RAR.

- **Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)**

The FY 2017 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. 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 2017 Budget Book:

### Revenues:

- **State Share of Instruction (SSI)**, is budgeted to increase by $2.3 million (5.2%). About ¾ of this variance owes to the growth in the statewide pool of funding (which was in part predicated on the tuition freeze mandated by HB64); the balance derives from Sinclair’s better than average results on the performance-based metrics driving the allocation formula. Although still a significant contributor to the college’s revenue stream at 34.5% of the total, Sinclair’s projected allocation for FY 2017 is $2.7 million less than it received in FY 2011 (-5.5%), the recent high water mark for the college.

- **Montgomery County Levy** revenues are predicted to improve by $4.6 million or 14.8% in relation to FY 2016’s revised budget as the college realizes the first full fiscal year of benefit of the 1.0 mill levy passed in November 2015 (herein referred to as “Levy B”).

- **Tuition and Fees (Credit Based)** comprise the second largest revenue category in the college’s general fund with a share of roughly 32.7%. This category is forecast to decline slightly as the result of a diminution in the average effective tuition rate paid due in part to outsized growth in the College Credit Plus (CCP) and education programs for incarcerated persons. No tuition rate increase is included in the budget pursuant to the freeze imposed by HB64.

- **Workforce Development** income is expected to increase about 6% overall on the strength of a sizable improvement in billings from the Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) sector driven by a clearer regulatory environment and a robust sales pipeline.

- **Investment** income shows no change in expected results as compared with the current year at $2.3 million.

- **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 earnings for the Board Endowment and a host of other miscellaneous income streams too small to report individually. The summary forecast for this group of revenues is essentially flat versus FY 2016.

### 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 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 this year’s budget development, this category is 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. **Internal service charges** (Amounts charged to auxiliary operations for their usage of college property and services)

As the foregoing example from the FY 2017 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 seven area functions grouped into three departments:

1. **IT Applications** combines the Application Administration and Application Development departments under one umbrella. Collectively, these two groups are responsible for management and support of software development, implementation, maintenance and architecture design for enterprise application and business systems, web-based services and mobile applications.

2. **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 we continue to meet the growing needs of the college. Application Administration consists of five senior programmers, two system administrators and an application administrator.
**Application Development** is responsible for the design, development, maintenance and overall architecture of websites and web-based applications services; 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.

**IT Operations** combines the User Support / HelpDesk and Telecommunications departments under one umbrella. IT Operations is the center of Sinclair’s technology frontline, providing efficient management of internal and external resources, processes, and service providers.

**User Support** oversees several different areas, including the IT Help Desk that provide telephone support, IT Labs that provide in-person support, and Multimedia Event Support.

**Telecommunications** manages the IT Network Infrastructure, Voice communications and administration, and Multimedia Systems administration on the Dayton Campus and Remote Learning Centers.

**IT Systems** combines the Application Delivery, End-User Computing and Server-Based Computing departments under one umbrella. IT Systems is the center of Sinclair’s frontline systems, providing efficient management of internal and external resources, processes, and service providers.

**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.

Each year IT develops a Master Plan for the year that guides the activities in these seven 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 collaborative 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. Figure 5.16 displays the IT Master Plan Development Process.

To provide a sense of the scope of the plan, Figure 5.17 provides a list of the Project List for 2016-17 in the Master Plan.

Technology is used extensively in both the delivery of, and support for, educational instruction. All of the College’s classrooms are equipped with multimedia podiums, providing 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. Sinclair’s Help Desk provides training and technical assistance to both students and faculty via the shell online and by phone. In addition, students have access to online communities in eLearn that provide training and support for use of the College’s Learning Management System.
• Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly
• Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

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, and 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 2017, 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 19 full-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 Core Strategies. Four Core Strategies provide the core of Sinclair’s strategies: Access and Affordability; Quality and Innovation in the Core Strategies.

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 Core Strategies. Four Core Strategies provide the core of Sinclair’s strategies: Access and Affordability; Quality and Innovation in the Core Strategies.

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.
discussed in section 5I3, extensive renovation of an existing building at a cost of tens of millions of dollars was discussed. Prior to approving the project, it was determined that the project aligned with the Quality and Innovation Strategic Priority to an extent that justified the expenditure of funds, and that the cost would not jeopardize the excellent financial health of the institution. The decision to move forward with the project hinged upon an analysis of fit with Core Strategies and risk to the institution.

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 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 Department of Higher Education 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 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 Sinclair Board of Trustees has adopted a policy requiring submission of an annual capital budget for the coming year, which is reviewed by the Board’s Finance and Investment Committee. Approval of the Budget can be found online in Board resolutions each year (see https://www.sinclair.edu/www/assets/File/Hom-AboSin-BrdTrst/resolutions/2016/2016-17-Capital-Budget-Recommendation-for-FY2017.pdf for the approval of the FY 2017 Capital Budget by the Finance and Investment Committee).

Internal and External Reviews and Audits. The College is highly committed to the value of external audits to assess and minimize risk. Annually a public accounting and business advisory firm reviews the financial statements prepared by the Accounting Department. The College subsequently posts Board of Trustees approval of the Annual Audit Reports on its Board Resolutions website (see http://www.sinclair.edu/www/assets/File/Hom-AboSin-BrdTrst/resolutions/2016/2016-44_Annual_Audit_Report_for_FY2016.pdf for an example from FY 2016).

Emergency Preparedness. Emergency preparedness is given high priority at Sinclair. Information on emergency preparedness is available on the website for the Department of Public Safety (see http://www.sinclair.edu/services/conduct-safety/public-safety/planning-for-emergencies/).

An online Emergency Procedures guide (http://www.sinclair.edu/services/conduct-safety/public-safety/planning-for-emergencies/emergency-procedures-guide/) provides procedures to be used in the following emergencies:

- Active Shooter
- Bomb Threat
- Civil Disturbance
- Earthquake/Building Collapse
- Evacuation
- Fire or Explosion
- Hazardous Material Spill
- Human Bodily Fluids
- Lockdown Procedure
- Medical Emergency
- Power Outage
- Suspicious Packages
- Tornado/Severe Weather

5R3 What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- 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 5.18 lists prior year highlights from the FY 2016-17 IT Master Plan. As can be seen, IT had either completed or nearing completion of 78 Master Plan projects by the end of the year, in addition to the completion of 21 additional projects that were not part of the original master plan.

Figure 5.19 compares Sinclair in terms of the time that systems are available 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 5.20 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.

As can be seen in Figure 5.21, generally Sinclair is lower than industry benchmarks in terms of the percent of calls made to the Help Desk which are hung-up before being answered.

Figure 5.22 provides some operational highlights from the FY 2016-17 IT Master Plan. These numbers provide a good overall picture of the...
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
AQIP CATEGORY SIX: QUALITY OVERVIEW

CATEGORY INTRODUCTION
Sinclair's four Core Strategies 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 Core Strategies. 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 select 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 Core Strategies 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 Core Strategies. 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 6 focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement culture and infrastructure of the institution. This category gives the institution a chance to reflect on all its quality improvement initiatives, how they are integrated and how they contribute to improvement of the institution.

CATEGORY RESPONSES
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES

Quality Improvement Initiatives focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution.

6P1 | Describe the processes for determining and integrating CQI initiatives, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting, deploying, and evaluating quality improvement initiatives

The four Core Strategies 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 Core Strategies. 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 2017 (see http://www.sinclair.edu/about/president/cabinet/ for the current membership of President’s Cabinet).

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 Core Strategies, 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 are generated from internally recognized opportunities for improvement. An excellent example of this is exemplified in our current AQIP Action Project, “Streamlining Admissions and Enrollment Processes.” In developing our Competency-Based Education programs, it became apparent to those involved that our enrollment processes were not as linear as they could be. A close analysis of current processes led some stakeholders in various departments of the college to conclude that enrollment steps were often not clear to students, that handoffs of enrolling students between departments was not as smooth or seamless as it should be, and that these barriers may cause prospective students to become confused, overwhelmed, and ultimately decide not to attend Sinclair. These concerns were forwarded from the departments in question to the Provost. The Provost and Associate Provost brought the initiative to President’s Cabinet for consideration: after a thoughtful discussion, that group made 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.

On other occasions, external events inspire CQI initiatives. In recent years, increasing student completion rates emerged as the top priority in higher education, and this emphasis has created a need for institutions nationwide to address how completion numbers could be improved. 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 recently completed AQIP Action Project, “Building a Holistic Advising System,” was one major component of these completion initiatives, and successfully implemented a 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 dovetailed with much of Sinclair’s existing work in the area. See Figure 6.3 for results from this project.

Regardless of whether a CQI initiative is motivated by external expectations or through internal process improvement recognition, in both cases President’s Cabinet determines how the opportunity will be addressed and oversees its implementation. 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 President’s Cabinet periodically receives official progress report presentations.

President’s Cabinet also evaluates the impact of the CQI initiatives, frequently calling upon RAR to perform an analysis and report results. Unfortunately, often these initiatives involve processes where improvements may not be seen in outcome measures for several years. Many efforts at increasing completion rates, for example, take 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 instances, results can be seen more quickly, as was the case in 2006-07 when 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 6.12 in 2R1.

- Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

Sinclair first joined AQIP more than a decade ago, and in that time has participated in three Strategy Forums, completed three Systems Portfolios prior to this one, and completed eleven AQIP Action Projects in addition to the current four. Aligning all of these activities comes easily to Sinclair, given its laser focus on the four Core Strategies 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 the Strategy Forums since their development, which in turn guided the selection of the AQIP Action Projects that Sinclair has chosen. As can be seen in the previous sections of this document, these Core Strategies 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 Core Strategies that guide the institution in fulfilling its mission.
Figure 6.2 displays Sinclair's completed and current AQIP Action Projects and aligns them to the relevant Strategic Priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION PROJECT AND COMPLETION DATE</th>
<th>STRATEGIC PRIORITY ACTION PROJECT IS ALIGNED WITH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking Assessment to the Next Level (2006-10-16)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising (2006-09-15)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Linkages and Student Readiness (2006-02-06)</td>
<td>Access and Affordability / Community Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Student Services (2010-11-01)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Success (2011-06-01)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Retention and Success (2012-11-29)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the First Year Student Experience (2014-05-01)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance Evaluation System (2014-05-01)</td>
<td>Effective and Sustainable Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion (2015-10-30)</td>
<td>Effective and Sustainable Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting an Institutional Policy Review with a Completion Focus (2015-10-30)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a Holistic Advising System (2016-10-01)</td>
<td>Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support / Community Alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing and Anticipated Completion Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION PROJECT AND GOAL</th>
<th>AVAILABLE OUTCOMES DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building a Holistic Advising System (Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support / Community Alignment)</td>
<td>87% of all new students met with their academic advisor and received an academic plan (MAP) in the spring of 2015. Students with MAPs are 3.4 times more likely to be retained and twice as likely to complete a credential. 99% of students surveyed rated their advising experience as having “met” or “exceeded” their expectations. The advising redesign is part of a larger student completion plan, which resulted in an increase in course completion from 71% in Spring 2013 to 74% in Spring 2015 and 76.0% in Spring of 2016. Cut average wait times for advising services from 30 minutes to 8 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting an Institutional Policy Review with a Completion Focus (Quality and Innovation in Student Learning and Support)</td>
<td>Policy changes were implemented in the following areas: Attendance/Withdrawal Policy for Online Students; Satisfactory Progress for Accelerated (competency-based) Students; How to Succeed Online is a required prerequisite for all online sections. The college changed the prerequisite for MAT 1440—Excursions in Math, from MAT 1370—Intermediate Algebra to MAT 1270—Beginning Algebra, effective Fall 2015. Effective Fall 2015, the college lowered the cut score in Accuplacer for placing into MAT 1470—College Algebra, which is a score lower than the maximum set by Ohio’s remediation-free standards. Certificate programs are now fully embedded in degree programs within the Science, Math and Engineering division. The auxiliary services fee implemented in fall of 2015 provides unlimited parking access to all Sinclair students, eliminating the daily pay by exit charge. Students are informed that they must see an academic advisor and receive a My Academic Plan (MAP) under a new advising model. To comply with a new state policy that requires all associate degree programs to be under 65 credit hours, 27 programs reduced their credits required for a degree by a total of 166 credits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Course Scheduling for Student Success and Completion (Effective and Sustainable Organization)</td>
<td>This was a project with a broad scope, one that initiated a large number of changes that are currently being carried forward by other units on campus. Accomplishments over the last year of the project included advances on seven distinct initiatives within the project: Course Scheduling Analytics; Course scheduling cost effectiveness; Block Scheduling; New Tools/Processes for Scheduling Sections; Two Year Course Planning Guide; My Academic Plan (MAP) Tools Utilization; Setting Course Section Capabilities. One measure of course scheduling efficiency that is used at Sinclair is the Average Class Size (ACS) metric, which conceptually is a measure of the number of enrollments divided by the number of sections offered. In spite of this project, the college continues to struggle with overall average class size, and the other units that are continuing this work are addressing this. Fall 2010 Sinclair Overall Average Class Size: 19.19; Fall 2011 Sinclair Overall Average Class Size: 18.82; Fall 2012 Sinclair Overall Average Class Size: 18.45; Fall 2013 Sinclair Overall Average Class Size: 18.35; Fall 2014 Sinclair Overall Average Class Size: 18.50; Fall 2015 Sinclair Overall Average Class Size: 18.11; Fall 2016 Sinclair Overall Average Class Size: 18.21 Between 9/1/14 and 9/1/15, 18,077 MAPs were created; 11,555 of these are currently marked as ‘active’. 66% of students registered for Fall 2015 had a MAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIATIVE / DESCRIPTION</td>
<td># OF STUDENTS SERVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Credit Plus (CCP): CCP Program went into effect beginning with the 2015-16 school year and replaced all early college credit programs. CCP is open to any student enrolled in 7th-12th grade who is a resident of Ohio and is enrolled in an Ohio secondary school. CCP provides college-ready students the opportunity to earn both high school and college credit before high school graduation.</td>
<td>1,305 in 2011-12, 1,000 in 2012-13, 1,626 in 2013-14, 2,877 in 2014-15, 3,421 in 2015-16, 3,950 in 2015-16 (projected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Prep: (1) Increase the number of college credits earned by Tech Prep students in high school. Work with high school supervisors and teachers to increase course opportunities, provide teacher training, resources and links, and increase the number of credits earned in high school. (2) Enhance access to and use of enhanced Tech Prep scholarships. Design the &quot;scholarship crosswalk&quot; to demonstrate the 209 licenses, certificate and degree options available to Tech Prep students. Increase Tech Prep merit scholarships. More students will matriculate to Sinclair due to increased opportunities in their career pathway.</td>
<td>15,321 in high schools, at Sinclair and at other colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Bridge: The 2016 Summer Bridge program is comprised of incoming Dayton Montgomery County Scholarship students and Taylor Scholarship students who will be attending Sinclair. Summer Bridge is designed to provide multiple opportunities for students to connect with the college, with their scholarship program, and with each other, all while preparing for their first year of college.</td>
<td>112 students took part in 2016 Summer Bridge from June through August.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the initiatives that follow in Figure 6.4 through Figure 6.11, the following apply:

- **How are the results are shared?** Results are shared in the Completion Overview report annually.
- **How often are the data collected?** Data are collected annually for the Completion Overview report.
- **Who is involved in collecting the data?** Sinclair’s Office of Research, Analytics, and Reporting performs data collection and analysis.
Career Communities: Career Communities have been developed to offer students targeted support based on their program of study. Every community has a steering committee composed of faculty, advisors, librarians, and student support personnel who collaborate to address the needs of students and help them develop a sense of belonging and solidify career goals as early as possible.

Deciding Day: “Deciding Day” is an event that allows students to talk to faculty and staff in multiple fields to get more information and guidance. Students are given a short assessment about broad career areas and then are directed to recommended career community areas.

Free Application for Student Aid (FAFSA) Outreach: The Financial Aid & Scholarships office (FA&S) has participated in more than 80 on and off campus events centered around support; and it individualizes processes to achieve academic goals and college success.

Veteran Services: Veteran Services assists veterans and military family members with accessing and using VA Education Benefits. Veteran Services provides support for veterans both at Sinclair and with community partners.

Auto Grad Improved Credentialing Process: Starting in Fall 2016, the college began analyzing student records and automatically graduating students who had earned credentials, rather than waiting for them to apply for graduation. This process continues to be improved to ensure deserving students receive their earned credential.

Articulation Agreements: Articulation Agreements are formal agreements between organizations detailing the recognition of college credit between those organizations. Sinclair uses articulation agreements as a means to avoid duplication of resources and to encourage and enhance students’ interests in post-secondary education and transfer from one institution to another.

Programs at Correctional Facilities: The Advanced Job Training Program offers pathways in the following areas: Culinary Management, Customer Service, Supply Chain Management, Business Foundations, Community and Social Services, Global User Support, and Greenhouse Management. Students have the opportunity to complete up to two 1-year certificates or pathways while incarcerated. Upon release, students may complete their associate’s degree in any of the 7 pathways, in either a traditional or online class setting.
As discussed in 6P1, many of Sinclair’s quality improvement efforts center around increasing completion, and particular mention was made of the change in process whereby students were awarded credentials without having to apply to graduate. Figure 6.12 displays trends in completion since FY 2000-01 for degrees, one-year certificates, and short-term certificates. Note the dramatic increase in completions from FY 2006-07 to FY 2007-08, particularly for certificates and short-term certificates. This internally generated CQI initiative, overseen by President’s Cabinet, had an immediate impact on student success with documentable results.

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 O.6 in the Institutional Overview provides an overview of Sinclair’s current AQIP Action Items. These four projects will be the priority quality improvement initiatives over the next few years.

In addition to the AQIP Action Projects and the various ongoing projects presented in Figure 6.4 through Figure 6.11, the completion initiatives (described in greater detail in section 2P2) will be the focus of the CQI work for the next several years. Priority projects underway by the Completion Office as part of these initiatives for the next few years include:

- Increase Percentage of Students Who Enroll (Reduce Summer Melt) - In partnership with Morehouse Spelman, & Georgia State, identify barriers to enrollment to low income students of color and increase yield rate between application and first day of classes.
- Math Pathways - Sinclair has won an Ohio Department of Higher Education grant to partner with Wright State University to develop co-requisite remediation in Mathematics.
- Career Advising for Undecided Students - Beginning at their first appointment, academic advisors ask students about career plans and assess their level of certainty. Undecided students are first placed into a career community where they can explore options within broad fields such as health sciences, STEM, liberal arts, or business.

No data are yet available for these projects. 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. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.D. in this section.

6P2 Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- 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 Core Strategies 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 Core Strategies and KPIs, 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. 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.

Sinclair’s website (see http://www.sinclair.edu/about/offices/provost/aqip/) 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.”

One way 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 6.13 displays the team members for the current AQIP Action Teams, and helps underscore the cross-functional composition of these teams.

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. Using assessment of assessment practices to make improvements is also strongly encouraged at Sinclair, as evidenced in the discussion in 1P1 the currently ongoing work regarding revision and improvement of the rubrics used in the new direct assessment approach to General Education outcome assessment.
AQIP, and the spirit of continuous quality improvement that it 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.
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 6.15**.

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 6.16** 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 6.17** displays these results.

Benchmark comparisons with other Ohio institutions also provide evidence of quality, and also demonstrate the effectiveness of efforts to increase student completion at Sinclair. Sinclair generally enrolls roughly 10% of Ohio’s for-credit community college students, yet since 2007 has produced 14% of degree and certificate completers, with the second highest total in the state over that period of the 23 institutions included. Over that period, Sinclair has produced more completers than the bottom nine institutions combined. **Figure 6.18** provides additional detail.
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**Figure 6.18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State Community College</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>4,753</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>5,744</td>
<td>37,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>3,314</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>3,587</td>
<td>4,786</td>
<td>56,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga Community College</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>28,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>17,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens State Community College</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>16,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati State Tech. &amp; Community College</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>14,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking Technical College</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>14,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark State College of Technology</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>15,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland Community College</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>11,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Rhodes State College</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>7,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark State Community College</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>6,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ohio Technical College</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>5,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane State College</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>4,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central College</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>6,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern State Community College</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison State Community College</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>4,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest State Community College</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>4,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Community College</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Technical College</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>4,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Technical College</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>3,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Gateway Community College</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>3,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra State Community College</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>3,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Community College</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality Overview**

**Figure 6.18**

**Results of Annual Community Poll regarding Quality at Sinclair**

- **90%** Believe the community is better with Sinclair than without.
- **88%** Believe Sinclair offers a high quality education at an affordable price.
- **76%** Rate Sinclair’s overall quality education as good or excellent.
Sinclair manages to produce the second most degrees and certificates of any community college in the State of Ohio, while maintaining the lowest tuition (in-county) of any public higher education institution in the state, and while at the same time spending more per student on Instruction, Academic Support, and Student Support and less on Administration and Facilities relative to the average, as Figure 6.19 demonstrates.

Taken together, Figure 6.18 and Figure 6.19 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 except one, while spending more in areas that directly impact students and less on administration, institutional overhead, and facilities that Ohio institutions in general. 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.

**Based on 6R2, what process 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:

- **Institutional Overview**: Over the next couple of years the four AQIP Action Projects described in Figure O.6 will be among the top priorities for improvement efforts at Sinclair:
  - Developing a Sustainable Structure to Support Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship
  - Enhancing Student Complaint Processes
  - Increasing Alignment of Updated Curriculum and Website Processes
  - Streamlining Application and Admissions Processes

- **Section111/112/113/114**: Sinclair plans to augment the existing assessment work that includes department level assessment, student self-ratings, and employer ratings with institutional-level direct assessment of the General Education outcomes. In recent terms Sinclair has piloted the use of rubrics in English and Communication courses to provide direct assessment data on the Written Communication and Oral Communication General Education outcomes. These rubrics are currently being revised in collaboration with the departments in question, and the pilot will be expanded in the coming year. Similar rubrics are in the process of being developed to launch pilots for the other General Education outcomes. In the next few years Sinclair will have extensive data it can provide departments on performance of their students in terms of achievement of General Education outcomes. The Annual Update and Program Review processes will incorporate this new source of General Education assessment data in the next few years.

- **Section 115**: A review of trends in student conduct reports reveals 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, the current director has plans to improve the incident tracking uniformity, consistency, and dissemination practices, which will allow for better trend analysis across future years.

- **Section 211**: The “Leveraging Information for Transformation (LiFT!)” initiative will be assessed over the next few years to determine whether it is making an impact on student learning, retention, and success.

- **Section 212/213**: 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. Priorities over the next one to three years will include the launch of new predictive analytics and course scheduling software to keep students on track to completion, further implementation of 15-month associate degrees, expansion of the Pathways pilot to additional academic departments to create and track academic and nonacademic milestones, restructuring of the Summer schedule, and expansion of credit-based Competency-Based Education (CBE) programs.

- **Section 214**: Sinclair is currently working on development of a more comprehensive, centralized process for collection and analysis of complaints by students and other stakeholders. It is anticipated that very soon Sinclair will be able to provide data on academic complaints, student services complaints, Title IX complaints, complaints from community members, etc. and the resolution of those complaints.

- **Section 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. The continuing work of the Completion Office as described in 2P2 and 2P5 will be a focus for improving quality over the next few several years.

- **Section 311/312/313**: One recent change that was made in the Faculty Performance Review (FPR) FPR process is that an electronic, online process...
has replaced the submission of a hard-copy document, and monitoring of the effectiveness of this change will need to occur in the next few years. As noted, the new Annual Full-Time and Part-time Staff Performance Evaluation was announced in March 2017, with training occurring that month and into April, with the first year's evaluations due for submission at the end of May 2017. For the next several years Sinclair will be assessing the success of revisions to its employee evaluation systems.

- **Section 4I1**: Sinclair’s Strategic Priorities will be reviewed in the years prior to the next Systems Portfolio, and may be revised as appropriate. Currently the priority initiatives include College Credit Plus (Ohio’s dual enrollment program), implementation of the Health Sciences Strategy, implementation of Integrated Student Services (the Generation 4 initiative), and promotion of the relatively new Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) programs.

- **Section 4I2**: 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 continue to be a top priority at Sinclair for many years to come.

- **Section 4I3/4I4**: 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 5I1**: 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, and additional training will be required in association with that increased usage.

- **Section 5I2**: Sinclair has developed new online tools to assist chairs in building course schedules and managing enrollment. The Average Class Size tool is an example of this, which was described in detail in section 5P1. It is hoped that the Average Class Size tool and other new online tools will help chairs more effectively manage the number of sections initially offered each term.

- **Section 5I3**: Instructional Technologies will continue to attempt around 90 projects a year. In addition, the implementation of the new Health Sciences Strategy, which includes the renovation of an existing building into a dedicated Health Sciences building, will be a priority in the next three years.

- **Section 6I1**: 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 four 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.