



2015-20 Quality Assurance Funding

TENNAIR Conference

August 6, 2015



History of Performance Funding in TN

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 1974 | Planning begins with collaboration between higher education institutions, governing boards, national advisory panel and THEC |
| 1978-1982 | Tennessee first state to utilize outcomes for state funding
Institutions earn up to 2% over operating budget |
| 1988-1992 | Emphasis shifts from process of assessment to performance outcomes
Institutions earn up to 5.45% over operating budget |
| 2000-2005 | Aligned with Master Plan |
| 2005-2010 | Focus on Articulation and Transfer |
| 2010-2015 | Shift retention and graduation rates to Outcomes Based Funding Formula |
| 2015-2020 | Name change to Quality Assurance Funding (QAF) to distinguish mission from the Outcomes Based Funding Formula |



Standards Review Process

- Collaboration between institutions, governing boards and THEC staff
 - Advisory Committee
 - Scoring Subcommittee
 - Academic Program Subcommittees

- 2015-20 Cycle Defining Features
 - Academic Programs
 - Institutional Satisfaction Study
 - Adult Learner Success
 - Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement
 - Student Access and Success



2015-20 QAF Standards

Standard	Community College	University
I. Student Learning and Engagement	75	75
• <i>General Education</i>	15	15
• <i>Major Field Assessment</i>	15	15
• <i>Academic Programs</i>	15	25
• <i>Institutional Satisfaction Study</i>	10	10
• <i>Adult Learner Success</i>	10	10
• <i>Tennessee Job Market Graduate Placement</i>	10	NA
II. Student Access and Success	25	25
TOTAL	100	100



General Education

Standard	2010-15 University	2015-20 University	2010-15 Comm. College	2015-20 Comm. College
General Education	15	15	15	15

Purpose: provide incentives to institutions for improvements in the quality of their undergraduate general education program as measured by the performance of graduates on an approved standardized test of general education

- Approved General Education Assessments: ETS and CCTST
- Reverse transfer students tested upon University degree completion
- Revised sampling option for institutions:
 - 95% confidence level with a margin of error of 3



General Education

Scoring Years 1-3:

- Performance on general education assessment will be evaluated at different points in the cycle
 - For years 1-3, comparison of the institutional average score for a given cycle year with the national average for that year

Table 1: General Education Scoring Table
Scoring for Years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18

National Average	100%	99%-98%	97%-96%	95%-94%	93%-92%	91%-89%	88%-86%	85%-84%	83%-82%	81%-80%	79%-78%	77%-76%	75-74%	73%-72%	701%-70%	>70%
Points Awarded	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



General Education

Scoring Years 4-5:

- For years 4-5, comparisons of the institutional average score for a given cycle year with the national average (Table 2A) and the three-year moving average (Table 2B)

Table 2A: General Education Scoring Table

Scoring for Years 2018-19 and 2019-20

National Norm Comparison

Average	100%	99%- 97%	96%- 94%	93%- 91%	90%- 88%	87%- 85%	84%- 82%	81%- 79%	78%- 75%	74%- 70%	> 70%
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Table 2B: General Education Scoring Table

Scoring for Years 2018-19 and 2019-20

Institutional Trend

% Accredited Programs	100%	99%- 94%	93%- 88%	87%- 82%	81%- 75%	Below 74%
Points	5	4	3	2	1	0



Major Field Assessment

Standard	2010-15 University	2015-20 University	2010-15 Comm. College	2015-20 Comm. College
Major Field Assessment	15	15	15	15

Purpose: to provide incentives for institutions to improve the quality of major field programs as evaluated by the performance of graduates on approved examinations

- Include all Praxis II and edTPA data for teacher licensure graduates
- Revise associate degree new program maturity status exemption from 5 to 3 years
- New Locally Developed Test implementation timeline – 3 year process



Major Field Assessment

Timeline

- New Locally Developed Test implementation timeline:

Year/ Phase	Expectation
Year 1: Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the Plan form and submit to THEC • Create assessment
Summer/ Fall Semesters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure institutional staff and/or 2 external consultants to review assessment • Send copies of all materials to campus coordinator
Spring Semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make adjustments to assessment • Pilot administration
Year 2: Baseline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess all expected graduates from fall and spring terms using new test • Test results used for comparison in the reporting year
Year 3: Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess all expected graduates from fall and spring terms • Institution must report both baseline year and reporting year data for scoring



Major Field Assessment

Scoring

- Comparisons made by dividing the institutional average by its comparison score average for that reporting year (no attainment may exceed 100%)
- Overall percentage rounded to the nearest whole percentage point
- Scoring is cumulative and new scores will be added in each succeeding year of the cycle

Table 3: Major Field Assessment Scoring Table

% Institution to National or Institutional Average	100%	99% to 98%	96% to 97%	95% to 94%	93% to 92%	91% to 89%	88% to 86%	85% to 84%	83% to 82%	81% to 80%	79% to 78%	77% to 76%	75% to 74%	73% to 72%	71% to 70%	Below 70%
Points	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



Academic Programs

Standard	2010-15	2015-20	2010-15	2015-20
	University	University	Comm. College	Comm. College
Academic Programs	25	25	15	15

Purpose: incentivize institutions to achieve and maintain program excellence and accreditation

- Revise Program Review and Academic Audit rubrics to:
 - Increase uniformity across content and scoring
 - Reflect research-based best practices
 - Align more closely with SACS-COC standards
- Amend program status exemption from 5 to 7 years for doctoral programs
- Uniform 4-point likert scale across all rubrics



Academic Programs

Scoring - Accredited Programs

- Number of accredited programs divided by the total number of accreditable programs to calculate the overall accreditation percentage
- Percentage used to generate points for the standard based on Table 4

Table 4: Accreditation Scoring Table						
% Accredited Programs	100%	99% - 94%	93% - 88%	87% - 82%	81% - 75%	Below 74%
Points	5	4	3	2	1	0



Academic Programs

Scoring - Non-accreditable Programs (Program Evaluation)

- Scores calculated by averaging all scored criteria for the program being evaluated, excluding those items judged “not applicable”
- Value used to generate points for the standard based on the Table 5
- Cumulative scoring and new scores added in each succeeding year of the cycle

Average	3.0- 2.9	2.8- 2.7	2.6- 2.4	2.3- 2.1	2.0- 1.8	1.7- 1.5	1.4- 1.2	1.1- 0.9	0.8- 0.6	0.5- 0.3	0.2- 0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



Institutional Satisfaction Study

Standard	2010-15	2015-20	2010-15	2015-20
	University	University	Comm. College	Comm. College
Satisfaction Study	10	10	10	10

Purpose: incentivize institutions to improve the quality of programs and services as evaluated by surveys of key stakeholders

- Unique schedule for universities and community colleges:

Cycle Year	University	Community College
Year 1 – 2015-16	NSSE Survey	SENSE Survey
Year 2 – 2016-17	Alumni Survey	CCSSE Survey
Year 3 – 2017-18	FSSE Survey	SENSE Survey
Year 4 – 2018-19	NSSE Survey	CCSSE Survey
Year 5 – 2019-20	Comprehensive Report	Comprehensive Report



Institutional Satisfaction Surveys: Community Colleges

Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
Year 1: 2015-16	Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE)
Year 2: 2016-17	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 3: 2017-18	Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) SENSE/CCSSE Qualitative Analysis Report
Year 4: 2018-19	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Year 5: 2019-20	Comprehensive Satisfaction Study Report



Year 1 Satisfaction Study: SENSE

Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE)

- Complements CCSSE with a more narrowed focus on early student experiences
- Provides picture of student behaviors in the earliest weeks of college and the institutional practices that affect students during this critical time

SENSE Engagement Themes	
Early Connections	3 questions
High Expectations and Aspirations	1 question
Clear Academic Plan and Pathway	4 questions
Effective Track to College Readiness	3 questions
Engaged Learning	16 questions
Academic and Social Support Network	3 questions
Total	30 questions



Year 1 Satisfaction Study: SENSE

Scoring:

- 30 of the SENSE engagement theme questions scored
 - Questions will be considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range
- Peer enrollment comparisons based on the following categories:
 - Small colleges (fewer than 4,499 students)
 - Medium colleges (4,500 – 7,999 students)
 - Large colleges (8,000 – 14,999 students)
 - Extra-large colleges (15,000 or more students)

SENSE Scoring Table

Year 1: 2015-16

SENSE Scoring Table											
Year 1: 2015-16											
# of questions at or above mean	30-28	27-25	24-22	21-19	18-16	15-13	12-10	9-7	6-4	3-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



Years 2 & 4 Satisfaction Study: CCSSE

Scoring

- Scoring based on 38 questions from the CCSSE Engagement Themes

CCSSE Engagement Themes	
Active and Collaborative Learning	7 questions
Student Effort	8 questions
Academic Challenge	10 questions
Student-Faculty Interaction	6 questions
Support for Learners	7 questions
Total	38 points

- Questions considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range

CCSSE Scoring Table											
Year 2: 2016-17 and Year 4: 2018-19											
# of questions at or above mean	38-35	34-31	30-27	26-23	22-19	18-15	14-11	10-7	6-3	2-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



Year 3 Satisfaction Study: SENSE

Quantitative Scoring - 7 points

- 30 SENSE engagement theme questions
 - Questions considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range
 - Peer groups remain the same from Year 1

SENSE Scoring Table								
Year 3: 2017-18								
# of questions at or above mean	30-27	26-23	22-19	18-14	13-9	8-4	3-1	0
Points Awarded	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



Year 3 Satisfaction Study: SENSE/CCSSE

Qualitative Scoring - 3 points

- Engage the results of both surveys to examine discrepancies in the perceptions and behaviors of students
- Report should address the 3 SENSE/CCSSE focus questions in 5 pages or less

SENSE/CCSSE Qualitative Analysis Report Scoring Rubric	
Year 3: Year 2017-18	
SENSE/CCSSE Focus Questions	Points Possible
Using the SENSE and CCSSE report results, identify any concerns, points of interest, or discrepancies between perceptions/values of entering students (SENSE) and other students (CCSSE).	1
What are the institution's current priorities as related to their Strategic Plan? What do the SENSE and CCSSE results reveal about the priorities, and how might they impact these priorities?	1
How might the institution address the differences in responses between entering students (SENSE) and other students (CCSSE)? Formulate a plan of action to address concerns and rectify any discrepancies.	1
Points Awarded	3



Institutional Satisfaction Surveys: Universities

Cycle Year	Satisfaction Study
Year 1: 2015-16	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Year 2: 2016-17	Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
Year 3: 2017-18	PEG Alumni Study NSSE/FSSE Qualitative Analysis Report
Year 4: 2018-19	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Year 5: 2019-20	Comprehensive Satisfaction Study Report



Years 1 & 4 Satisfaction Study: NSSE

- Universities measured based on their performance as compared to their selected peer group
- Select peer group of six universities within the same Carnegie classification and located in the SREB member states
 - Peer institutions must have utilized NSSE in the year the survey is administered or one year prior

NSSE Engagement Themes	First Year Students	Senior Year Students
Academic Challenge	17 questions	17 questions
<i>Higher Order Learning</i>	4 questions	4 questions
<i>Reflective & Integrative Learning</i>	7 questions	7 questions
<i>Learning Strategies</i>	3 questions	3 questions
<i>Quantitative Reasoning</i>	3 questions	3 questions
Learning with Peers	8 questions	8 questions
<i>Collaborate Learning</i>	4 questions	4 questions
<i>Discussions with Diverse Others</i>	4 questions	4 questions
Experiences with Faculty	9 questions	9 questions
<i>Student-Faculty interactions</i>	4 questions	4 questions
<i>Effective Teaching Practices</i>	5 questions	5 questions
Campus Environment	13 questions	13 questions
<i>Quality of Interactions</i>	5 questions	5 questions
<i>Supportive Environment</i>	8 questions	8 questions
Total Possible Points	47 Points	47 Points



Years 1 & 4 Satisfaction Study: NSSE

Scoring

- Scoring based on the 47 questions selected from the NSSE Engagement Themes
- Questions considered successful when the institutional average is at or above the peer mean among first year students and senior year students within a 0.02 range

Table 6: NSSE Scoring Year 1: 2015-16 and Year 4: 2018-19											
# of questions at or above mean	94-85	84-73	72-63	62-53	52-43	42-33	32-23	22-13	12-3	2-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



Year 2 Satisfaction Study: FSSE

Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)

- FSSE is a web-based survey administered each spring to faculty at colleges and universities that administer the National Survey of Student Engagement
- FSSE focuses on:
 - Faculty perceptions of how often students engage in different activities
 - The importance faculty place on various areas of learning and development
 - The nature and frequency of faculty-student interactions
 - How faculty members organize their time, both in and out of the classroom
- Administer to a representative sample of faculty to explore perceptions of student engagement and assess teaching practices as it relates to the NSSE engagement themes



Year 2 Satisfaction Study: FSSE

Scoring

- Performance compared to their selected peer group
- Peer groups include:
 - 6 universities within the same Carnegie classification
 - Located in the SREB member states
 - Utilized FSSE in the year the survey is administered or one year prior

FSSE Engagement Themes	
Academic Challenge	17 questions
Higher Order Learning	4 questions
Reflective & Integrative Learning	7 questions
Learning Strategies	3 questions
Quantitative Reasoning	3 questions
Learning with Peers	8 questions
Collaborate Learning	4 questions
Discussions with Diverse Others	4 questions
Experiences with Faculty	12 questions
Student-Faculty interactions	4 questions
Effective Teaching Practices	8 questions
Campus Environment	14 questions
Quality of Interactions	5 questions
Supportive Environment	9 questions
Total	51 points



Year 2 Satisfaction Study: FSSE

Scoring

- Scoring based on the 51 questions selected from the FSSE Engagement Themes
- Up to 51 points can be earned for each question on which an institution scores at or above the peer mean within a 0.02 range

Table 7: FSSE Scoring

Year 2: 2016-17

# of questions at or above mean	51-47	46-42	41-37	36-32	31-27	26-22	21-17	16-12	11-7	6-1	0
Points Awarded	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



Year 3 Satisfaction Study: PEG

Performance Enhancement Group (PEG) Alumni Attitude Survey

- The Alumni Attitude Survey gives participating institutions the tools to:
 1. Obtain institutional peer benchmarking
 2. Increase partnership with alumni
 3. Improve strategic planning and deployment
 4. Enhance communications to targeted audiences
 5. Understand alumni perceptions
 6. Hear stories from your alumni
 7. Increase support for campus partnerships
 8. Focus on what matters most to your alumni
 9. Prioritize actions/programs
 10. Optimize resources
- Uniform instrument for Quality Assurance Funding
- Allows for individual institution customization



Year 3 Satisfaction Study: PEG

Alumni Survey Development Timeline

- **Summer 2016:** Subcommittee formed with one representative from each university to:
 - assist in survey development
 - gather feedback from campuses
- **Winter 2017:** PEG survey finalized
- **Fall 2017:** PEG Alumni Survey administered
- **Spring 2018:** PEG provides survey analysis
- **August 2018:** Universities submit data for 2017-18 QAF Report



Year 3 Satisfaction Study: NSSE/FSSE

Qualitative Analysis Scoring- 3 points

- Engage the results of both surveys to examine discrepancies in the perceptions and behaviors of students and faculty
- Report should address the 3 NSSE/FSSE focus questions in 5 pages or less

NSSE/FSSE Qualitative Analysis Report Scoring Rubric Year 3: 2017-18	
NSSE/FSSE Focus Questions	Points Possible
1) Using the FSSE-NSSE combined report results, identify any concerns, points of interest, or discrepancies between student behaviors and faculty perceptions/values.	1
1) What are the institution's current priorities as related to their Strategic Plan? What do the NSSE and FSSE results reveal about the priorities, and how might they impact these priorities?	1
1) How might the institution address the differences in responses identified in Question 1? Formulate a plan of action to address concerns and rectify any discrepancies.	1
Points Awarded	3



Year 5: Comprehensive Report Community Colleges and Universities

- Submit an Institutional Satisfaction Study Comprehensive Report based on the surveys administered in years 1 through 4
 - provide evidence of the usage of the satisfaction surveys for institutional planning and improvement

Scoring:

Comprehensive Report Criterion*	Points Possible
Design and Administration	1
Data Analysis	3
Plan of Action	3
Outcomes	2
Continuous Improvement	1
TOTAL	10

*See Appendix J – Institutional Satisfaction Study: Comprehensive Report Scoring Rubric



Adult Learner Success

Standard	2010-15 University	2015-20 University	2010-15 Comm. College	2015-20 Comm. College
<i>Assessment Implementation</i>	10	-	10	-
Adult Learner Success	-	10	-	10

Purpose: incentivize institutions to address unique needs and improve services for adult learners

- **Qualitative:** Institutions perform a self-study, gather feedback from adult students and develop an action plan to better serve the needs of adult students
- **Quantitative:** Institutions work to increase the retention and completion rates of adults
- Alignment with Tennessee Reconnect and 2015-25 Master Plan



Adult Learner Success

Scoring: Qualitative and Quantitative

Adult Learner Success Scoring Indicators				
Year	Qualitative Indicators		Quantitative Indicators	
2015-16	Self-Assessment	7 points	Graduates	3 points
2016-17	Action Plan	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2017-18	Status Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2018-19	Status Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points
2019-20	Comprehensive Report	4 points	Retention Graduates	3 points 3 points

Table 11: Adult Learner Success Scoring Graduates and Retention Rates				
Goal Attainment	100% - 91%	90% - 81%	80% - 50%	Below 50%
Points	3	2	1	0



TN Job Market Graduate Placement

Standard	2010-15 University	2015-20 University	2010-15 Comm. College	2015-20 Comm. College
Job Placement	NA	NA	10	10

Purpose: incentivize community colleges to continue to improve job placement of program graduates

- Name change from Job Placement to TN Job Market Graduate Placement to more accurately reflect data
- Utilize data for Tennessee Longitudinal Data Set (TLDS) that allows for uniform data analysis across all community colleges
- TLDS compiles data from
 - TN Department of Education
 - TN Department of Labor
 - THEC



TN Job Market Graduate Placement

Advantages

- Uniform, statewide data source from a fixed point in time across institutions
- THEC provides data to institutions, similar to sub-population process
- Captures individuals continuing education

Challenges

- No longer “in field” placement
- Currently Tennessee data only

Scoring

Placement Rate	100%-97%	96% - 93%	92% - 89%	88%-85%	84% - 81%	80% - 77%	76% - 73%	72% - 69%	68% - 65%	64% - 61%	> 61%
Points	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0



TN Job Market Graduate Placement

Calculation of TN Job Market Placement

- The placement rate is calculated by dividing the total number of graduates working full-time in any of the four quarters after graduation by the total number of graduates in the Tennessee Job Market
 - Tennessee Job Market consists of graduates employed full-time in Tennessee and those approved for an unemployment insurance claim in Tennessee

	A	B	C	B+C	C/(B+C)
Community College	Graduates	Unemployment Claim	Employed Full Time	TN Job Market	TN Job Market Employment Rate
Example 1	125	10	100	110	91%
Example 2	375	20	330	350	94%



Standard II: Student Access and Success

Standard	2010-15 University	2015-20 University	2010-15 Comm. College	2015-20 Comm. College
Student Access & Success	25	25	25	25

Purpose: incentivize institutions to increase the number of graduates from select focus populations

- Focus populations aligned with 2015-25 Master Plan

2015-20 Focus Populations		
African-Americans	High Needs Geographic Area	Health Programs
Hispanic	Low-Income	STEM
Males	Veterans*	Institutional Selection
Assoc. Degree Grads Enrolled at Public Univ.	Baccalaureate Degree Grads Previously Earned Assoc. Degree	Graduate Degrees: African American, Hispanic or STEM*

* New in the 2015-20 QAF cycle



Student Access & Success

Scoring

- Progress evaluated by comparing the three-year number of graduates rolling average with the attainment in that year
- Ratio derived by dividing the attainment figure by the three year average. The resulting percent attainment will be rounded to the nearest whole percentage and compared to Table 13 to award points for this indicator
- Points summed for all five focus populations with a 25 point maximum

Percent Attainment	100% - 99%	98% - 95%	94% - 90%	89% - 85%	84% - 80%	Below 80%
Points	5	4	3	2	1	0



Next Steps

- Focus populations due September 1, 2015
- Reporting template available May 2016
- First report due August 2016



Contact Information
Victoria Harpool
Victoria.Harpool@tn.gov