



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PLAN

Piedmont Community College

2017-18

Person County Campus
P.O. Box 1197
Roxboro, NC 27573
Telephone: (336) 599-1181
Fax: (336) 597-3817

Caswell County Campus
P.O. Box 1150
Yanceyville, NC 27379
Telephone: (336) 694-5707
Fax: (336) 694-7086

Web: www.piedmontcc.edu

Approved: April 2018

[This page intentionally left blank.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	4
Piedmont Community College	4
Institutional Effectiveness	4
Special Topics	5
2. Piedmont Community College Mission, Values, and Vision	6
North Carolina Community Colleges Mission	7
3. Piedmont Community College Strategic Goals and Objectives	7
4. Outcomes Assessment	10
Service Area Outcomes Assessment Example	11
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example	13
5. NCCCS 2016 Performance Measures for Student Success	18
Performance Measures	18
Baselines and Excellence Levels	19
Results	20

The hardcopy archive of Piedmont Community College Institutional Effectiveness Plans is located in the Office of Research and Institutional Effectiveness, Room B-115 on the Person County Campus. Related documents and other supporting materials are available via hardcopy or in digital form by request.

1. Introduction

Piedmont Community College

Piedmont Community College (PCC), a comprehensive two-year community college, is one of 58 colleges that make up the North Carolina Community College System. The College, which began operation on July 1, 1970, serves the educational needs of the residents of Person and Caswell Counties. The Person County Campus in Roxboro comprises 12 buildings totaling 123,000 square feet located on 178 acres. The Caswell County Campus in Yanceyville includes two buildings totaling 25,000 square feet located on 13 acres. The College served 4,967 students¹ during the 2016-17 academic year in continuing education and curriculum programs and currently employs approximately 178 full-time and 131 part-time employees.

Institutional Effectiveness (IE)

Piedmont Community College employs a continuous, systematic cycle of planning, budgeting, operations management, and evaluation to guide achievement of the College Mission, Values, and Vision, within the wider context of the mission and goals of the North Carolina Community College System. Collectively, these activities constitute the Annual Institutional Effectiveness and Budgeting (AIEB) process at the College. This AIEB process explicitly integrates planning, budgeting and effectiveness evaluation into a closed-loop cycle of continuous improvement to strengthen operations, to refine subsequent annual and strategic goals and objectives, and (periodically) to review the College Mission, Values, and Vision.

The Office of Research and Institutional Effectiveness (ORIE) continuously monitors multiple indicators of institutional effectiveness in addition to the outcomes identified in the Service Area Outcomes (SAO) documents, and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) documents. Traditional measures of student progress and success, Program Area Reviews (PARs) and Service Area Reviews (SARs), NCCCS Performance Measures, and other indicators of effectiveness are routinely reviewed and reported to the College community through various means, including the ORIE website and individual reports.

This IE Plan includes the usual annual review of fundamental principles and processes guiding current operations and long-range planning at the College, comprising three components:

1. Review of the College Mission, Values, and Vision, demonstrating consistency with the mission of the North Carolina Community College System;
2. Review of the College goals and objectives identified in the recently approved 2015-2020 College Strategic Plan;

¹ This number represents the *unduplicated* head count of students enrolled in one or more programs at the College any time during the 2016-2017 academic year (*Source*: 2016-17 Annual Statistical Report, North Carolina Community College System).

3. Review of continuous service area outcome (SAO) assessment processes and student learning outcome (SLO) assessment processes, complying with standards of the College regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges.

As was noted last year, the accumulation of multiple years of assessment results has substantially increased the length of this IE Plan. The current Plan includes examples of the 2016-17 SAO and SLO assessments. The SAO assessment example is from Buildings and Grounds / Safety and Preparedness area from the Administrative Services division. The SLO assessment example is from the Associate in Science Degree program from the Mathematics and Science program area.

Special Topics

The 2015-16 IE Plan devoted “special topics” attention to the updated Mission, Vision, and Values statements and the new 2015-2020 Strategic Plan as well as the GAP analysis examining area workforce demand and PCC program development. This new 2017-18 IE Plan continues to include attention to the report, *2016 NC Community Colleges Creating Success: Performance Measures for Student Success*. This special topic treatment includes a description of performance measures approved in 2016 by the State Legislature together with updated benchmarks identifying baselines and targets for the performance measures. A detailed explanation of the calculations for performance-based budget allocations and an analysis of the 2016 allocations earned by PCC can be found in last year’s IE plan, *Institutional Effectiveness Plan: Piedmont Community College 2016-17*.

2. PCC Mission, Values, and Vision

The Mission, Values, and Vision statements were updated during the development of the 2015-2020 College Strategic Plan. These revised statements and the Strategic Plan were approved by the College Board of Trustees in July 2015.

Mission

Piedmont Community College enriches lives by providing education, training, and cultural opportunities for lifelong learning and professional success in local, regional, and global communities.

Values

Learning-Centered Philosophy

The College embraces a learning-centered instructional environment supporting multiple student learning styles.

Economic Development

The College acts as a catalyst for local and regional economic development by providing education and training to address current and emerging workforce needs.

Accessibility

The College provides affordable and accessible education and training.

Diversity/Global Citizenship

The College promotes understanding and appreciation of diverse cultures and global citizenship.

Ethics/Social Responsibility

The College values the principles of personal ethics, integrity, academic honesty, civic responsibility, and accountability.

Resources

The College provides learning resources and student development support designed to address diverse student learning styles and academic needs.

Student Success

The College values individual student success as the single best indicator of institutional effectiveness in the community.

Mission and Values Adopted Spring 2010; Revised July 2015

Vision

Piedmont Community College strives to be the leading contributor to the economic, educational, and cultural vitality of our communities by providing high-quality services and programs that ensure student success in personal development and professional achievement.

Vision Adopted Summer 2011; Reviewed January 2013; Revised October 2014, July 2015.

The Piedmont Community College Mission and Vision resonate closely with the Mission of the North Carolina Community College System:

North Carolina Community College Mission

The mission of the North Carolina Community College System is to open the door to high-quality, accessible educational opportunities that minimize barriers to post-secondary education, maximize student success, develop a globally and multi-culturally competent workforce, and improve the lives and well-being of individuals by providing:

- ✎ Education, training and retraining for the workforce including basic skills and literacy education, occupational and pre-baccalaureate programs.
- ✎ Support for economic development through services to and in partnership with business and industry and in collaboration with the University of North Carolina System and private colleges and universities.
- ✎ Services to communities and individuals which improve the quality of life.

Adopted by the State Board of Community Colleges, October 1993; revised March 1994, April 1994; reaffirmed January 1998; revised and adopted June 1998; revised and adopted September 2006

3. PCC Strategic Goals and Objectives

STRATEGIC PLAN 2015-2020 Piedmont Community College

Strategic Theme 1

BRANDING, MARKETING, AND PROMOTION

Objective 1.1: BRANDING MESSAGES

The College will develop branding messages that communicate the mission, vision, values, and program strengths to our multiple community constituencies, including prospective students and their parents, area employers, civic leaders, and elected officials.

Objective 1.2: GENERAL RECRUITMENT

The College will develop a comprehensive marketing plan and general recruitment strategies that address the diverse education and training needs/interests of various prospective student populations using current and emerging communication modes and technologies.

Objective 1.3: HIGH SCHOOL RECRUITMENT

The College will develop and implement a specific marketing plan for recruiting at high schools and with high school students and their parents to achieve the following outcomes:

- ✎ Increase the percentage of high school students who complete at least one College course while still in high school;
- ✎ Increase the percentage of high school students who earn at least one semester of full-time college credit while still in high school;
- ✎ Increase the percentage of high school students who enroll at the College within one year of high school graduation.

Strategic Theme 2

RESPONSIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Objective 2.1: CURRICULUM PROGRAMS

The College will expedite development and implementation of new curriculum programs responsive to transfer student interests and employment demand disclosed by the Gap Analysis and other regional education and employment data.

Objective 2.2: CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The College will work closely with local and area employers to create and implement continuing education programs leading to industry-recognized credentials addressing: (1) current and emerging workforce needs and (2) other employment demand identified by the Gap Analysis.

Objective 2.3: PROGRAM RESOURCES

To supplement resources available for new program development, the College will closely monitor operating outcomes to reallocate from programs suffering enrollment decline reflecting limited employment and/or transfer demand.

Objective 2.4: DELIVERY OF SERVICES AND INSTRUCTION

The College will continue developing, monitoring and improving the delivery of instruction and student support services via multiple delivery modes using current and emerging technologies.

Objective 2.5: STUDENT SUCCESS LEARNING INSTITUTE (SSLI) INITIATIVE

The College will actively participate in the SSLI initiative to improve student persistence, progress, completion, and subsequent academic and/or employment success.

Strategic Theme 3

PARTNERSHIPS

Objective 3.1: PUBLIC SCHOOL ARTICULATION

The College will pursue multiple initiatives with traditional and charter public schools and with home school parents to improve student progress and completion rates in PCC programs, including:

- ✎ Establishment of a Cooperative Innovative High School for Person County high school students on the Person County Campus enrolling students beginning in fall 2016.
- ✎ Establishment of a Cooperative Innovative High School for Caswell County high school students on the Caswell County Campus enrolling students beginning in fall 2016.
- ✎ Establishment of a Cooperative Middle School for Person County students at the Timberlake Center beginning fall 2018.

Objective 3.2: TRANSFER ARTICULATION WITH FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

The College will develop or update existing articulation agreements with the four-year institutions to which the largest numbers of PCC alumni transfer, and will establish additional articulations with other UNC institutions and private four-year institutions within North Carolina and Virginia.

Objective 3.3: HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER

The College will establish a Higher Education Center collaborating with area colleges and universities to offer Bachelor's and Master's degree coursework in selected programs on the Person County Campus.

Objective 3.4: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The College will work with governmental economic development departments and Workforce Development Boards to create and deliver education and customized training to address explicitly commissioned workforce requirements for attracting at least one major new employer to the College service area.

Strategic Theme 4

EFFECTIVENESS

Objective 4.1: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

The College will implement the Institutional Research Data Solution developed by the Center for Applied Research at Central Piedmont Community College, to strengthen institutional research capacity for monitoring multiple measures of student retention, progress and success, as well as other indicators of operating performance specified in this Strategic Plan.

Objective 4.2: OPERATING EFFICIENCIES

The College will continue work to develop and refine institutional research capabilities for monitoring operating efficiencies among all service areas and educational program areas.

Objective 4.3: OUTCOMES EFFECTIVENESS

The College will continue to strengthen service area and student learning outcomes effectiveness assessment and the uses of assessment results to improve teaching and learning, shorten completion times, and reduce student educational expense.

Objective 4.4: STRATEGIC ACTION PLANS

The College Vice Presidents will direct the development of individual action plans for executing objectives of this Strategic Plan within each College Division, including task lists, target dates, lead and supporting staff and faculty accountable, projected resource requirements, and intended outcomes with performance indicators and targets. The President and Vice Presidents will establish budget priorities for items in these action plans and adjust timelines accordingly.

Strategic Theme 5

CAPITAL NEEDS AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Objective 5.1: FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

The College will seek support from Person County and Caswell County to contract with a professional consultant for development of an updated Facilities Master Plan, specifically including infrastructure and building construction or acquisition and renovation to accommodate:

- ✎ Facilities needs of current and anticipated allied health programs;
- ✎ Long-term facilities needs of the Cooperative Innovative High Schools described in Strategic Theme 3;
- ✎ Projected instructional facilities needs of Bachelor's and/or Master's degree courses offered on the Person County campus in the Higher Education Center described in Strategic Theme 3;

- ✧ Establishment of a second ingress/egress road to improve the convenience and safety of access to and from the Person County Campus;
- ✧ New space and facilities needs on the Caswell Campus to address anticipated workforce needs identified by the Gap Analysis.

Objective 5.2: BOND ISSUE

The College will work with appropriate government agencies to develop a bond proposal strategy to secure financing for major capital needs for facilities and equipment identified in the updated Facilities Master Plan described above.

Objective 5.3: CAPITAL FUND-RAISING CAMPAIGN

The College will plan and execute a comprehensive capital fund-raising campaign to support multiple initiatives in this Strategic Plan and the updated Facilities Master Plan, including program start-up expenses as well as facilities and equipment.

4. Outcomes Assessment

As was noted in the Introduction this IE Plan includes one example of a Service Area Outcomes (SAO) assessment plan and one example of a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment plan. The examples provided in this section demonstrate the ongoing refinement of assessment plans to foster continuous improvement of services to students and staff and the quality of teaching and learning at PCC. The SAO assessment plan example from *Buildings & Grounds / Safety and Preparedness* illustrates the explicit connections between service area outcomes and the goals and objectives of the 2015-2020 College Strategic Plan. The SLO assessment plan example from the *Associate in Science Degree* program illustrates the explicit connections between learning outcomes in individual courses and broader program outcomes. Both examples summarize at least three years of assessment results and uses of these results to improve services, teaching, and learning.

The SAO and SLO assessment plans presented here are current snapshots of assessment processes whose evolution will continue responding to changing internal and external opportunities and challenges.

Service Area Outcomes Assessment Example BUILDINGS & GROUNDS, SAFETY & PREPAREDNESS: 2016-2017

Intended Service Area Outcome and College Strategic Theme/Objective Addressed	Means of Assessment and Performance Target or Completion Date	Assessment Results AY 2016-17	Assessment Results AY 2015-16	Assessment Results AY 2014-15
1. Students, faculty, and staff will enjoy clean, aesthetically pleasing study and work conditions reflecting the quality of College facilities and their maintenance. (2.4, 4.2)	The mean response to the Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) for each individual item addressing campus cleanliness and aesthetics will meet or exceed the established College-wide Standard: MEAN response of 3.0 or higher, where: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, and 4=Strongly Agree (items worded so agreement is desirable). Open-ended comments are reviewed for additional information.	Mean responses on the SSS all exceed 3.00. A couple of comments addressed the lighting on campus. A couple of comments addressed the upgrading and cleanliness of the bathrooms and one comment addressed the smell of the drain near the kitchen.	Mean responses on the SSS exceed 3.00 and only one comment addressed the age of buildings and need for renovating and updating, not cleanliness.	Two items had a score under 3.0 on the SSS. Exterior lighting scored 2.99 and had no comments; and the HVAC system creating too much heat or cooling to everyone on the campus.
	The mean response to the faculty/staff Educational Support Services Survey (ESSS) for each individual item addressing campus cleanliness and aesthetics will meet or exceed the established College-wide Standard: MEAN response of 3.0 or higher, where: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Disagree, and 4=Strongly Disagree. <i>(Survey items constructed for agreement preferred.)</i> Open-ended comments are reviewed for additional information.	Mean responses on the ESS all exceed or maintain at 3.00. A handful of comments compliment the friendliness and excellence of the housekeeping and maintenance staff. A handful of comments again address the lighting across campus. A couple of comments address the grounds and exterior of the buildings needing a little more detail. And a few comments address the need for more cleanliness in housekeeping areas while many compliment the cleanliness of our facilities.	Mean ESS responses all exceed 3.00, but a handful of comments addressed deferred maintenance and age of some older College facilities.	Means for all items exceeded 3.0 in the 2013-14 ESSS. The comments about Maintenance, Custodial, and Security services remain very positive.
2. Students, faculty and staff will enjoy protection from safety and security hazards afforded by College compliance with safety standards and adherence to accepted	College will successfully comply with ADA, OCR and OSHA regulations and standards, and will comply with state and local codes and inspections.	No new compliance deficiencies have been identified for ADA, OCR, or OSHA requirements. No change	No new compliance deficiencies have been identified for ADA, OCR, or OSHA requirements.	The College completed items identified in the OCR visit from 2010. Several items were multi-year projects.

Service Area Outcomes Assessment Example

Intended Service Area Outcome and College Strategic Theme/Objective Addressed	Means of Assessment and Performance Target or Completion Date	Assessment Results AY 2016-17	Assessment Results AY 2015-16	Assessment Results AY 2014-15
security practices. (2.4, 4.2)				
	The mean response to the faculty/staff Educational Support Services Survey (ESSS) for each individual item addressing campus safety and security will meet or exceed the established College-wide Standard: MEAN response of 3.0 or higher, where: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Disagree, and 4=Strongly Disagree. (Survey items constructed for agreement preferred.) Open-ended comments are reviewed for additional information.	The mean responses for two ESSS items (addressing the adequacy of external campus lighting and campus safety personnel at night) all exceeded 3.00.	The mean responses for two ESSS items (addressing the adequacy of external campus lighting and campus safety personnel at night) remain marginally below 3.00 (2.95 and 2.96, respectively).	Means for all items exceeded 3.0 in the 2014-15 ESSS. No faculty shared open-ended comments indicating continuing concerns about security and lighting identified in previous recent surveys. Most classroom doors are lockable from the inside with the recent lock upgrades.
	The mean response to the Student Satisfaction Survey for each individual item addressing campus safety and security will meet or exceed the established College-wide Standard: MEAN response of 3.0 or higher. Open-ended comments are reviewed for additional information.	Mean responses on the Student Satisfaction Survey addressing campus safety all exceed 3.00.	Mean responses on the Student Satisfaction Survey addressing campus safety all exceed 3.00. Most of the handful of written comments recommended more campus lighting and more visible security personnel presence for night students.	Means for all items exceeded 3.0 in the 2013-14 SSS. Students expressed moderate concern about security not wearing a uniform, and evening outdoor lighting.
	Campus Incident Reports will be continuously monitored to identify threats to safety or security that require specific action plans.	No incidents on the annual Campus Safety and Security Report 2016		

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example

ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE					
Program Outcome	Student Learning Outcome	Measure of Assessment and Criteria for Success	Assessment Results		
			AY 2016-17	AY 2015-16	AY 2014-15
1. 2015-17: Engage in effective oral discourse in a scientific context. 2014-15: Communicate effectively within the academic community in a written format.	2015-17: Students will analyze significant scientific developments on a planetary level.	2015-17: 70% of students will score 70% or higher in debate content of ecological or environmental issue with classmates in BIO 111. Data collected: F	Fall 2016 F2F: 88% (15/17) Spring 2017 Overall: 75% (18/24) F2F: 75% (9/12) Hybrid: 73% (8/11)	Fall, 2015 Person: F2F: 100% (19/19)	
		2015-17: 70% of students will achieve a cumulative score of 6 or higher on the oral presentation portion of the debate assignment in BIO 111 using the PCC Assessment Rubric for Oral Communication, to score three attributes, each on a 0-3 scale. Data collected: F	Fall 2016 F2F: 100% (17/17) Spring 2017 Overall: 83% (20/24) F2F: 83% (10/12) Hybrid: 82% (9/11)	BIO 111: F2F PCC Rubric: 100% (19/19)	
	2014-15: Students analyze significant political, socioeconomic, and cultural developments in American history.	2014-15: 70.0% of students will score a 60% or better on the embedded mid-term essay questions. HIS 131/132.			Overall, 82% (93/114) Person: 85%% (44/52) Hybrid: : 74% (32/43)) Online: 89% (17/19)
2. Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills.	2015-17: Students will demonstrate understanding and application of the scientific method	2015-17: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on an assignment requiring conduct of a scientific experiment and analysis of experimental data in selected science courses: BIO 111/BIO 112/BIO 168/CHM 151 Data collected: F (BIO 111, BIO 168, CHM 151) or S (BIO 112)	Fall 2016 Overall: 90% (103/114) Bio 168 F2F: 86% (51/59) Bio 111 F2F: 88% (15/17) CHM 151 F2F: 100% (19/19) Spring 2017 Bio 112 Hybrid: 79% (11/14)	Fall, 2015 Person: BIO 168 F2F: 93% (39/42) BIO 111 F2F: 90% (18/20) CHM 151 F2F: 84% (16/17) Note: no BIO 111 internet offered this semester Spring, 2016 Person: BIO 112: 100% (26/26)	
	2014-15: Students will discuss analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of life span development information	2014-15: 70.0% of students will score a 70% or better on the Developmental Psychology Application paper. PSY 241			Hybrid: 86% (19/22) Online: 83% (19/23)

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example

ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE					
Program Outcome	Student Learning Outcome	Measure of Assessment and Criteria for Success	Assessment Results		
			AY 2016-17	AY 2015-16	AY 2014-15
3. Students will solve practical mathematical problems and use appropriate models for analysis and predictions.	2015-17: Students will solve problems that can be modeled by quadratic functions.	2015-17: 70% of students will score a minimum of a 6 on the Quadratics applied to area assignment in MAT 171 using the PCC Assessment Rubric for Math. Data collected: F	Fall, 2016 Overall: 75% (21/28) Online: 50% (5/10) Person: Hybrid: 88.89% (16/18)	Fall, 2015 Overall: 67% (29/43) Online: 71% (5/7) Person: Hybrid: 71% (12/17) Caswell: Hybrid: 63% (12/19)	
	2014-15: Students will solve Quantitative Reasoning (QR) problems in math courses containing QR activities as a part of the QEP.	2014-15: Students in Quantitative Reasoning (QR) math courses will demonstrate mastery of 70% of the QR competencies presented. (NOTE: Scores at right are for 63 different students who were scored on competencies presented in one or more QR activity "exposures.")			Overall: 77% (175/226) NOTE: 63 students were scored on one or more competencies in one or more QR activities. The total number of scores was 226, of which 175 demonstrated mastery. Person: 84/97=87% Hybrid: 38/67=57% Online: 53/62=85%
4. Students will demonstrate conceptual understanding and practical application of scientific concepts in Biology, Chemistry, or Physics	Biology: Students will demonstrate an understanding of life at the molecular and cellular levels.	70.0% of students will score 70.0% or higher on the knowledge content of a research paper on predator/prey cycles assignment in BIO 112. Data collected: S	Fall 2016 Bio 112 Hybrid 84% (16/19) Spring 2017 Bio 112 Hybrid: 64% (9/14)	Spring 2016 F2F Person: 100% (26/26)	Fall 2014 Hybrid: 70% (7/10) Spring 2015 Hybrid: 75% (9/12) Online: 100% (3/4)
		Added 2015-17: (predator/prey assignment): 70% of students will achieve a cumulative score of 10 or higher on the written portion of the predator/prey cycles assignment in BIO 112 using the PCC Assessment Rubric for Written Communication to score five attributes, each on a 0-3 scale. Data collected: S	Fall 2016 Bio 112 Hybrid 95% (18/19) Spring 2017 Bio 112 Hybrid: 72% (10/14)	Spring 2016 Hybrid Person: 89% (8/9) Hybrid Caswell: 100% (2/2)	
		70% of students will score 78% or higher on a reading quiz comparing and contrasting the four categories of hypersensitivities in BIO 169. Data collected: S	Fall 2016 Bio 169 F2F 85% (24/28) Spring 2017 Overall: 86% (38/44) Bio 169 F2F 88% (23/26) Bio 169 HYB 83% (15/18)	Spring 2016 F2F Person: 82% (37/45) F2F Caswell: 100% (2/2)	Fall 2014 Person: 86% Spring 2015 Caswell: 80% (8/10) Person: 86% (18/21)

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example

ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE					
Program Outcome	Student Learning Outcome	Measure of Assessment and Criteria for Success	Assessment Results		
			AY 2016-17	AY 2015-16	AY 2014-15
		80% of student will score 80% or higher performing a "Gram Stain" and identifying the gram status of bacterial cells in BIO 175. Data collected: S	Spring 2017 Bio 175 F2F 83% 15/18	Spring 2016 F2F Person: 94% (16/17)	Summer 2015 Hybrid: 75% (6/8)
		70% of students will score 78% or higher in an online exercise assessing and labeling the various stages of mitosis in BIO 168. Data collected: F	Fall 2016 Bio 168 F2F: 78% (46/59)	Fall 2015 Person: BIO 168 F2F: 100% (38/38)	Summer 2015 Online: 100% (18/18)
	Chemistry: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the fundamental principles and laws of chemistry.	70% of students will receive at least a 70% on the content of a comprehensive written assignment regarding their knowledge of the interactions of matter and energy in CHM 152. Data collected: S	Spring 2017 Bio 152 F2F: 100% (9/9)	Spring 2016 Person: CHM 152 F2F: 42% (3/7)	Spring 2015: CHM 132: 75% (3/4) Fall 2014: CHM 151: 75% (3/3) CHM 131: 85% (28/33)
		Added 2015-17: 70% of students will achieve a cumulative score of 10 or higher on the written assignment above in CHM 152 using the PCC Assessment Rubric for Written Communication to score five attributes, each on a 0-3 scale. Data collected: S	Spring 2017 Bio 152 F2F: 100% (9/9)	Spring 2016 CHM 152 F2F PCC Rubric: 42% (3/7)	
	Physics: Students will demonstrate their understanding of energy.	Revised 2015-17: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the Mechanical Energy assessment in PHY 151. Data collected: F	Fall 2016 Phy 151 F2F: 80% (4/5)	Fall 2015 Person: F2F: 85% (6/7)	
		2014-15: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the Forms of Energy assessment in PHY151.	Fall 2016 Phy 151: 100% (5/5)		Fall 2014: Person: 100% (7/7)
		Revised 2015-17: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the Electrical and Magnetic Energy assessment in PHY 152. Data collected: S	Spring 2017 Phy 152: 100% (3/3)	Spring 2016 PHY 152 F2F: 100% (3/3)	
		2014-15: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on a written composition and oral presentation describing a modern application of energy, electricity, heat or magnetism in PHY110.	Fall 2016 Phy 110: 100% (3/3)		Fall 2014 Person: 100% (5/5) Spring 2015 Person: 100% (9/9)
		70% of students will score 70% or higher on the content of an oral presentation, fact sheet and demonstration describing a modern application in PHY 110/110A. Data collected: F or S	Fall 2016 Phy 110: 100% (3/3)	Fall 2015 Person: F2F: 80% (5/6) Spring 2016 PHY 110 F2F: 100% (6/6)	
		Added 2015-17: 70% of students will achieve a cumulative score of 6 or higher on the oral presentation portion of the assignment in PHY 110/110A using the PCC Assessment Rubric for Oral Communication, to score three attributes, each on a 0-3 scale. Data collected: F or S	Fall 2016 Phy 110: 100% (3/3)	This measure of assessment was added after the deployment of this assignment in Spring 2016 PHY 110 F2F: 100% (6/6)	

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example
ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE
SUMMARY and ACTION PLANS**

STRENGTHS		
Based on 2016-17 Results: While some individual sections did not, overall all courses met or exceeded their criteria for success in all four of the program outcomes. In particular, the outcomes measuring science proficiency consistently demonstrate student performance at a C level or better.	Based on 2015-16 Results: BIO 111 students exceeded the goal of 70% in both content and oral presentation in Program Outcome #1; BIO 112 and BIO 168 students also exceeded the goal of 70% in Program Outcome #4.	Based on 2014-15 Results: Oral and written communication and critical thinking assessments demonstrate generally strong performance. Specialty assessments in biology and physics mostly reflect similarly strong performance.
WEAKNESSES		
Based on 2016-17 Results: General: The overall assessment plan is too cumbersome and reports similar data in multiple ways. In addition, several courses are used to measure outcomes that are not typically included in the AS program of study (Ex. BIO168, BIO169, BIO175, PHY110). Outcome #3. While there was an overall improvement in success (from 67% to 75%), students continue to be relatively weak in their ability to solve practical mathematical problems. This is particularly true of online students. It is the opinion of the instructors involved that the fault is not with the activity itself which they deem a good measure of the outcome. Instead it appears that the directions for the activity are not clear to all students which, in turn, skews the results.	Based on 2015-16 Results: Targets were not reached in two areas of assessment: 1) MAT 171 students did not reach the goal of 70% achieving a 6 or higher on the PCC Assessment Rubric in Math. However, this group did get close with an overall rate of success of 67.4%. The Person campus hybrid section (70.6%) and online section (71.4%) both met the goal and Caswell just fell short with 63.2%. In this course, this activity occurs early in the semester, which may have some bearing on how well the students do. 2) The target of 70% was not reached by CHM152 for the SLO [Students will demonstrate an understanding of the fundamental principles and laws of chemistry] under program outcome #4 [Students will demonstrate conceptual understanding and practical application of scientific concepts in Biology, Chemistry, or Physics]	Based on 2014-15 Results: Students encountered minor difficulty with the math assessments: students in the online and Person campus hybrid course barely met the target, but students in the Caswell campus hybrid course did not meet the target. The complexity of scoring for quantitative reasoning activities complicates interpretation of these outcomes. The biology assessment based on the Gam Stain lab just missed the performance target, but The specialty science SLO assessments for chemistry students were far short of the performance target, both for chemistry content and for effective written communication about chemistry.
ACTION PLAN(S)		
Based on 2016-17 Results: Outcomes #1 & #2: The assessment score will be adjusted to have a more rigorous criteria of success: 70% of students will achieve a cumulative score of 7 or higher (previously 6 or higher) on the assignment. Outcome #1: The two measures of assessment for the Bio 111 debate will be combined to eliminate redundancy and allow greater focus on critical areas for improvement. A more rigorous grading rubric will be created to ensure	Addressing 2015-16 Results: MAT 171: Because of the timing of this assignment the instructors will focus earlier on the skills of answering “why” and “explain” type questions, highlighting appropriate responses so students will have a better grasp of what is expected in their responses. The assessed activity is good, so we will continue to use the same activity and keep the goal of 70% scoring a 6 or better on the rubric. Since we have seen improvement in the past couple of assessment cycles,	Addressing 2014-15 Results: Responding to the complexity of interpreting the QR4U activity scores, the math faculty recommended restoration of the previous SLO assessments employing the PCC General Education Assessment Rubric for Math. The small number of students is not a substantial basis for significant changes to the biology curriculum. Moreover the faculty are reviewing why the performance target for the Gram Stain lab assessment was higher than targets for other

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example

<p>consistency in assessment.</p> <p>Outcome #2: Bio 168 will be removed from assessment, as it is not a course regularly taken by Associate in Science students.</p> <p>Outcome #3: The activity, Quadratics Applied to Area, is a conceptually sound assessment. Instructors will continue to use this for the next cycle. However, because of ambiguity in the wording of the questions, it will be revised to ensure students understand the objective of the questions. More concise instructions will be given at the beginning of the activity to ensure online students as well have a clear understanding of the expectations for the assignment. The criteria of 70% will be used again for the 2017-2018 assessment period.</p> <p>Outcome #4:</p> <p>Bio – The two measures of assessment will be combined to eliminate redundancy and allow greater focus on critical areas for improvement.</p> <p>The assessment score will be adjusted to have a more rigorous criteria of success: 70% of students will achieve a cumulative score of 12 or higher (previously 10 or higher) on the assignment.</p> <p>Investigation revealed, however, that students are still having trouble with the research aspect of the assignment. Additional class time will be spent in the Learning Resource Center guiding the students through their initial research. A LibGuide, specifically targeting online and hybrid learners, will also be created to guide in their research. The wording of Biology Student Learning Outcome will be adjusted to read: “Students will demonstrate an understanding of life at the molecular, cellular and/or organismal level.”</p> <p>Bio 168, 169 and Bio 175 will be removed from the assessment, as they are not courses regularly taken by Associate in Science students.</p>	<p>we are confident that the trend will continue and this year we will achieve our goal.</p> <p>CHM 152: Instructor will conduct an organized review with the class during the lab meeting before the assessment is made.</p> <p>BIO 111/112/168: Student learning outcomes that had a 100% success rate on the assessment will be monitored for another year. If this level of success continues, another outcome will be chosen on which to focus.</p>	<p>biology SLOs.</p>
---	--	----------------------

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example

<p>CHM – The two measures of assessment will be combined to eliminate redundancy and allow greater focus on critical areas for improvement. This outcome will continue to be monitored due to fluctuation of student success rates.</p> <p>PHY – The assessment score will be adjusted to have a more rigorous criteria of success: 70% of students will score 75% or higher (previously 70% or higher) on the Electrical and Magnetic Energy assessment in PHY 152. PHY 110/110A will be removed from assessment, as it is not a course regularly taken by Associate in Science students.</p>		
--	--	--

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Example

ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE CURRICULUM MAP

Course	Outcome 1 Engage in effective oral discourse in a scientific context.	Outcome 2 Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills.	Outcome 3* Solve practical mathematical problems and use appropriate models for analysis and predictions.	Outcome 4 Demonstrate conceptual understanding and practical application of scientific concepts in one of three scientific disciplines.
BIO 111	I, D	I, D		I, D
BIO 112		D, A		D, A
BIO 168		D, A		I, D, A
BIO 169		D, A		I, D, A
BIO 275				I, D
CHM 151		I, D, A		
CHM 152			D, A	I, D, A
MAT 143			I, D	
MAT 152			I, D, A	
MAT 171			D, A	
MAT 172			A	
MAT 271			A	
MAT 272			A	
PHY 110,110A	I, D		I, D	I, D
PHY 151		I, D	D, A	I, D
PHY 152		A	D, A	D, A

*Associate in Science students are introduced to problem-solving techniques either in their developmental math courses completed at the College or in prior high school courses, evidenced by their exemption of developmental math courses via placement testing or multiple measures guidelines.

I = Introduced **D** = Developed & Practiced w/Feedback **A** = Applied at Appropriate Level for Graduation

6. NCCCS 2017 Performance Measures for Student Success

Performance Measures

In 2010, a Performance Measures Committee was established to develop new performance-based student success measures to go into effect in 2013. During the development of these measures, it was determined that it was important to establish a three-year review process to ensure the measures and methods for evaluating colleges were current and remained focused on improving student success.

To facilitate the first three-year review of the measures, the Performance Measures Adjustment Committee was appointed to review the current set of measures and recommend deletions, revisions, and additions. This included individuals representing college leadership and research. The Committee formally presented the following seven measures to the State Board in March 2015:

Excerpted from 2016 Performance Measures Report
 North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS)

Performance Measures Newly-Defined in 2016 for Student Success [With Changes from 2015 Definitions]

Measure	Current (2016) Definition	Changes from Previous (2015)
Basic Skills Student Progress	Numerator: Of those in the denominator, the number of students completing the program year at a higher educational functioning level	Denominator: was students attempting 60 or more contact hours
	Denominator: Basic skills students who have post-tested and have accumulated 12 or more contact hours during program year. Excludes High Adult Secondary Education initial placements	
GED Pass Rate	This performance measure has been removed.	Numerator: Of the students in the denominator, number who complete the program year at a higher educational functioning level Denominator: Basic skills students attempting 60 or more contact hours during program year
Student Success Rate in College-Credit English Courses	Numerator: Of those in the denominator, the number earning a grade of "C" or better in at least one credit-bearing English course during their first two academic years	Denominator: was students in first credit-bearing English course who were developmental English and/or reading students during the same or previous academic year.
	Denominator: First-time fall curriculum students who have an Associate Degree primary curriculum program or are in a Career and College Promise College Transfer Primary Pathway	

continued

Measure	Current (2016) Definition	Changes from Previous (2015)
Student Success Rate in College-Credit Math Courses	<p>Numerator: Of those in the denominator, the number earning a grade of "C" or better in at least one credit-bearing Math course within their first two academic years.</p> <p>Denominator: First-time fall curriculum students who have an Associate Degree primary curriculum program or are in a Career and College Promise College Transfer Primary Pathway.</p>	<p>Denominator: was students in first credit-bearing English course who were developmental math students during the same or previous academic year.</p>
First Year Progress	<p>Numerator: Of those in the denominator, the number who complete at least 12 hours (including developmental) with a "P", "C" or better within their first year</p> <p>Denominator: First-time fall curriculum students attempting at least 12 hours (includes developmental courses and course withdraws) within their first academic year</p>	<p>Denominator: was credential-seeking students only (program code A, C, or D only)</p>
Curriculum Completion	<p>Numerator: Of those in the denominator, the number of students who by the fall that occurs 6 years after original cohort designation either graduate, transfer to a four-year institution, or are still enrolled and have previously completed 36 non-developmental hours</p> <p>Denominator: First-time fall curriculum students</p>	<p>Denominator: was credential-seeking students only (program code A, C, or D only)</p>
Licensure and Certification Passing Rate	<p>Numerator: Of those in the denominator, the number passing exam on first attempt during the licensure agency's most recent reporting year</p> <p>Denominator: All licensure and certification exams taken for the first-time during the licensure agency's most recent reporting year. Only includes state mandated exams which candidates must pass before becoming active practitioners</p>	<p>No change</p>
College Transfer Performance	<p>Numerator: Of those in the denominator, the number of students earning a GPA of 2.25 or better aggregated over the fall and spring semesters at the transfer institution</p> <p>Denominator: Students with an Associate Degree or at least 30 articulated transfer credits enrolled during the fall and spring semesters at a four-year institution who were enrolled at a community college during the previous academic year. Only includes North Carolina based four-year institutions</p>	<p>Numerator: GPA threshold at transfer institution was 2.00.</p>

Baselines and Excellence Levels

As previous performance measures were being finalized in 2012, a Performance Funding Committee was appointed to develop a performance funding model incorporated into colleges' regular formula budget allocations. One of the outcomes of this committee was the establishment of system-wide baseline and excellence levels for each measure. The committee recommended using consistent, statistically-defined levels to promote transparency, simplicity, and objectivity. This utilization of the levels is a departure from the System's historical use of "standards."

Based on three years of data (if available) for each measure, baseline levels are set two standard deviations below the system mean, and excellence levels are set one standard deviation above the system mean. These levels remain static for three years and are reset every three years.

Results

The table below compares the System benchmarks (baselines, excellence levels, averages, and totals) with PCC results for 2016 and for 2017. Importantly, note that a report year (i.e. the 2016 and 2017 just mentioned) reports data for the previous academic year (i.e. the 2016 Performance Report reports data for AY 2014-15).

2016-Report Performance Summary (AY 2014-15 data)

	BASIC SKILLS PROGRESS	CREDIT ENGLISH SUCCESS	CREDIT MATH SUCCESS	FIRST YEAR PROGRESSION	CURR COMPLETION RATE	LICENSURE PASSING RATE	TRANSFER PERFORMANCE				
System Excellence Level	68.3%	55.9%	32.5%	75.0%	51.9%	90.9%	87.6%	Met or Exceeded Excellence Level	Below Excellence Level, Above College Average	Below College Average, Above Baseline Level	Below Baseline Level
System Baseline	34.5%	23.8%	10.1%	54.1%	35.9%	69.9%	65.1%				
Average College Percentage	56.1%	46.9%	26.9%	68.4%	44.1%	82.3%	82.7%				
System Totals (All Students)	55.7%	48.4%	27.6%	67.6%	43.7%	84.4%	82.4%				
Piedmont CC	● 48.7%	● 55.8%	● 26.7%	● 72.4%	● 42.7%	● 60.3%	● 75.6%	0	2	4	1

Color indicators are based on the precise percentages and not the rounded percentages displayed.





2017-Report Performance Summary (AY 2015-16 data)

	BASIC SKILLS PROGRESS	CREDIT ENGLISH SUCCESS	CREDIT MATH SUCCESS	FIRST YEAR PROGRESSION	CURR COMPLETION RATE	LICENSURE PASSING RATE	TRANSFER PERFORMANCE				
System Excellence Level	68.3%	55.9%	32.5%	75.0%	51.9%	90.9%	87.6%	Met or Exceeded Excellence Level	Below Excellence Level, Above College Average	Below College Average, Above Baseline Level	Below Baseline Level
System Baseline	34.5%	23.8%	10.1%	54.1%	35.9%	69.9%	65.1%				
Average College Percentage	59.1%	50.9%	29.0%	70.5%	43.7%	82.0%	82.7%				
System Totals (All Students)	58.3%	52.0%	29.8%	69.7%	44.0%	84.1%	82.8%				
Piedmont CC	● 51.2%	● 63.0%	● 29.5%	● 72.6%	● 47.7%	● 70.5%	● 72.4%	1	3	3	0

Color indicators are based on the precise percentages and not the rounded percentages displayed.

The table on the following page shows the 2017 report's results for all 58 NC Community Colleges.

2017-Report Performance Summary (AY 2015-16 data)

	 Met or Exceeded Excellence Level	 Above College Avg, Below Excellence	 Above Baseline Level, Below Average	 Below Baseline Level	BASIC SKILLS PROGRESS	CREDIT ENGLISH SUCCESS	CREDIT MATH SUCCESS	FIRST YEAR PROGRESSION	CURR COMPLETION RATE	LICENSURE PASSING RATE	TRANSFER PERFORMANCE				
System Excellence Level	68.3%	55.9%	32.5%	75.0%	51.9%	90.9%	87.6%								
System Baseline	34.5%	23.8%	10.1%	54.1%	35.9%	69.9%	65.1%								
Average College Percentage	59.1%	50.9%	29.0%	70.5%	43.7%	82.0%	82.5%								
System Totals (All Students)	58.3%	52.0%	29.8%	69.7%	44.0%	84.1%	82.8%								
Alamance CC	49.1%	58.2%	33.4%	74.1%	43.0%	76.1%	85.6%	2	2	3	0				
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	55.6%	37.9%	26.2%	70.4%	45.0%	93.8%	90.9%	2	1	4	0				
Beaufort County CC	44.9%	35.7%	27.5%	66.9%	35.1%	78.6%	81.2%	0	0	6	1				
Bladen CC	68.9%	61.3%	43.0%	70.1%	24.1%	84.5%	71.1%	3	1	2	1				
Blue Ridge CC	49.1%	50.0%	32.5%	64.3%	38.5%	81.8%	89.7%	2	0	5	0				
Brunswick CC	69.7%	64.4%	45.6%	78.0%	41.4%	82.5%	84.3%	4	2	1	0				
Caldwell CC & TI	40.5%	49.6%	40.6%	76.3%	39.6%	77.3%	79.3%	2	0	5	0				
Cape Fear CC	51.7%	58.1%	36.3%	71.1%	45.3%	91.2%	81.5%	3	2	2	0				
Carteret CC	67.6%	57.6%	29.4%	68.6%	42.2%	86.9%	95.1%	2	3	2	0				
Catawba Valley CC	60.8%	62.9%	29.3%	78.7%	49.5%	86.8%	83.1%	2	5	0	0				
Central Carolina CC	77.0%	40.5%	29.1%	73.1%	41.4%	87.9%	75.9%	1	3	3	0				
Central Piedmont CC	55.9%	59.4%	37.2%	71.6%	44.1%	83.2%	81.0%	2	3	2	0				
Cleveland CC	79.4%	35.2%	38.4%	78.0%	49.0%	78.7%	77.0%	3	1	3	0				
Coastal Carolina CC	73.9%	64.4%	32.3%	76.4%	47.8%	92.1%	86.0%	4	3	0	0				
College of The Albemarle	56.4%	54.6%	27.3%	75.7%	48.9%	83.5%	85.6%	1	4	2	0				
Craven CC	55.5%	60.6%	26.7%	74.6%	46.2%	80.2%	81.1%	1	2	4	0				
Davidson County CC	62.5%	60.9%	33.2%	74.0%	48.3%	86.4%	83.4%	2	5	0	0				
Durham TCC	54.7%	55.2%	32.5%	64.7%	30.6%	88.5%	86.3%	1	3	2	1				
Edgecombe CC	63.4%	45.3%	14.4%	68.3%	31.7%	72.9%	87.1%	0	2	4	1				
Fayetteville TCC	59.9%	36.9%	18.6%	63.2%	42.4%	88.4%	83.3%	0	3	4	0				
Forsyth TCC	53.7%	57.5%	27.4%	68.0%	43.1%	88.9%	85.9%	1	2	4	0				
Gaston College	58.5%	56.4%	29.3%	72.4%	43.4%	94.2%	78.8%	2	2	3	0				
Guilford TCC	40.1%	47.7%	28.2%	60.1%	39.0%	86.8%	76.8%	0	1	6	0				
Halifax CC	51.1%	50.4%	21.1%	67.6%	39.2%	74.7%	70.5%	0	0	7	0				
Haywood CC	73.9%	50.2%	26.1%	68.3%	44.1%	84.7%	86.0%	1	3	3	0				
Isothermal CC	43.2%	60.7%	21.8%	74.5%	42.0%	71.6%	88.9%	2	1	4	0				
James Sprunt CC	77.7%	41.2%	24.8%	74.6%	56.2%	84.9%	76.4%	2	2	3	0				
Johnston CC	76.0%	53.7%	37.9%	77.0%	49.6%	83.2%	76.5%	3	3	1	0				
Lenoir CC	69.8%	43.9%	28.6%	70.2%	43.3%	79.8%	84.3%	1	1	5	0				
Martin CC	58.1%	29.8%	31.8%	69.4%	34.5%	56.3%	77.8%	0	1	4	2				
Mayland CC	63.4%	27.5%	16.3%	60.5%	50.2%	78.3%	93.2%	1	2	4	0				
McDowell TCC	69.6%	66.2%	51.0%	74.2%	40.9%	92.2%	84.8%	4	2	1	0				
Mitchell CC	50.5%	56.5%	31.1%	66.5%	53.1%	78.9%	82.3%	2	1	4	0				
Montgomery CC	59.2%	64.1%	22.9%	72.0%	44.8%	75.7%	83.3%	1	4	2	0				
Nash CC	44.4%	34.6%	33.7%	68.6%	46.4%	80.9%	83.7%	1	2	4	0				
Pamlico CC	86.8%	37.3%	35.8%	74.4%	52.2%	80.0%	80.0%	3	1	3	0				
Piedmont CC	51.2%	63.0%	29.5%	72.6%	47.7%	70.5%	72.4%	1	3	3	0				
Pitt CC	52.8%	44.4%	22.1%	60.0%	39.5%	79.8%	81.2%	0	0	7	0				
Randolph CC	58.2%	62.3%	30.5%	74.5%	44.2%	85.9%	87.1%	1	5	1	0				
Richmond CC	47.5%	60.0%	40.0%	66.8%	44.0%	83.9%	73.4%	2	2	3	0				
Roanoke-Chowan CC	41.4%	36.4%	4.7%	70.9%	47.1%	57.7%	80.6%	0	2	3	2				
Robeson CC	58.2%	35.4%	20.4%	51.9%	30.7%	71.2%	71.6%	0	0	5	2				
Rockingham CC	76.2%	53.1%	29.1%	66.5%	40.9%	79.2%	85.4%	1	3	3	0				
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	54.7%	56.5%	21.7%	64.3%	40.9%	76.2%	81.1%	1	0	6	0				
Sampson CC	48.7%	42.5%	26.2%	72.4%	58.7%	87.3%	83.8%	1	3	3	0				
Sandhills CC	47.6%	45.5%	20.1%	69.3%	49.7%	88.0%	86.5%	0	3	4	0				
South Piedmont CC	50.4%	56.7%	24.4%	68.9%	35.0%	77.4%	89.0%	2	0	4	1				
Southeastern CC	53.7%	36.8%	21.1%	56.6%	37.7%	72.1%	83.1%	0	1	6	0				
Southwestern CC	64.8%	52.0%	30.2%	74.0%	43.3%	89.4%	88.6%	1	5	1	0				
Stanly CC	64.2%	49.0%	31.6%	76.8%	49.6%	81.5%	87.0%	1	4	2	0				
Surry CC	43.2%	48.7%	25.6%	74.7%	41.2%	92.1%	84.4%	1	2	4	0				
Tri-County CC	52.1%	77.0%	17.7%	77.6%	50.5%	80.6%	88.2%	3	1	3	0				
Vance-Granville CC	57.1%	44.0%	19.5%	69.3%	44.7%	88.0%	83.2%	0	3	4	0				
Wake TCC	65.3%	52.2%	32.2%	68.1%	47.2%	91.1%	85.4%	1	5	1	0				
Wayne CC	80.1%	57.8%	27.3%	68.7%	53.0%	90.7%	84.0%	3	2	2	0				
Western Piedmont CC	72.7%	64.6%	38.1%	78.0%	45.3%	86.1%	80.9%	4	2	1	0				
Wilkes CC	48.6%	46.0%	37.5%	77.8%	47.0%	74.7%	76.1%	2	1	4	0				
Wilson CC	66.7%	40.7%	28.9%	71.9%	42.6%	80.3%	75.3%	0	2	5	0				

Note: Color indicators are based on the precise percentages and not the rounded percentages as displayed