Institutional Effectiveness Committee
February 11, 2011

Committee/Meeting Name	Institutional Effectiveness Committee				
Date	February 11, 2011	Starting Time	9:00 a.m.	Ending Time	10:30 a.m.
Location	Library 113			Recorder	Sarah Davis
Members Present	Danita McAnally, Dr. Lana Jackson, Kara Larkan-Skinner, Carol Bevel, John Gladstein, Mark Hanna, Macy Kohler, Judy Massie				
Guests					
Absent	Jon Bellah, Bobbie Hyndman, Jodi Lindseth, Jeanetta Smiley and Kerrie Young				

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
Committee Charge	"This committee oversees the ongoing development and refinement of the college-wide institutional effectiveness program. The committee scrutinizes the planning processes and keeps the college on a planning agenda that is outcome oriented as well as useful and reasonable. The committee gives input to the institutional research function to assure that research of value in decision making and in support of institutional effectiveness is consistently provided and utilized."	
3 Major Planning and Assessments at AC	1. Program Review • 5 to 7 year cycle for all programs now has • 4 Step Process: 1.) Self-Study by division under review 2.) External Review Committee (external to division but employees of AC); Present Oral Exit Report and Insert written responses in External Review of Program Review	Program Review cycle and 4 steps discussed PET Forms will be set for future meeting Planning and how it effects Budgeting will be reviewed at a future meeting

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	database (div has to do a follow-up 3.) Follow-Up Response (division responds to recommendations by identifying improvements and revisions based on recommendations of External Review Committee) 4.) Report before President's Cabinet (division leadership presents commendations, recommendations, improvements & revisions as a result of recommendations, & budgetary impact to fulfill recommendations, if any) 2. Planning & Evaluation Tracking (PET) Forms • Completed annually • Expected to use results to make improvements 3. Strategic Plan • *Strategic Plan through 2015* published Three key words from SACSCOC *Principles of Accreditation* regarding institutional effectiveness are: • Integrated – each assessment connected to other 2 • Ongoing – continuous; not just started for accreditation cycle • Systematic review – regular review of mission, goals and outcomes	

Institutional Effectiveness Committee
February 11, 2011

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	All plans should impact budget.	
I. Today's Focus – Program Review	1. What is or should be the purpose of program review? RESPONSES: • Step back and review goals that have been accomplished • Student learning success based on performance of student learning outcomes • Improvement – both program and college-wide • Make your case for the program/dept. existing • Should provide viable, effective outcomes • Justify that something could/should be done differently • Integrate Program Review with the Strategic Plan and accreditation • Provide a more specific look at an aspect of the College. Explain how that aspect of the College fits in with the with the puzzle pieces for the entire College.	1. Kara: Improvement should be what comes from what was found 2. Maci: Agree, to better the program 3. Carol: Purpose is to step back and see what you are doing. Are you meeting your goals you already had or not? 4. Judy: Agree to better improve program. If we are lacking, then they we see the weaknesses during the review. So, Program Review is about always looking for improvement. 5. John: Agree, to make us better and see about goals or lacking in an area. 6. Mark: It's all those things plus a time where you look to make your case for your program's existence. Many programs may be valuable but not necessarily all programs are necessary. Viable, effective, do we have outcomes and data that justify the program's existence. Does the data show we should do differently? Also, integrate with other assessments, but should match strategic plan closely. Accreditation

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	2. Has Program Review accomplished these purposes – and in particular has it been used as for making decisions based on evidence? If so, provide examples. • Not one improvement has been made as a result of Program Review. In the case of the Library, no substantive recommendations – just affirmed good work of the Library staff • Maci: Don't remember ever getting results from before, Danita said because it has not been done before for your program. • Judy: Examples of changes due to Program Review "honestly don't remember any" but job was being done OK • Mark: Personal suggestions are review should be to help us do a better job—believes in the process; but it seems to never make a difference - unless the committee feels your area is vital in their minds (priorities to the College comes first in those that have the power) • John: Vaguely remembers from the past two years a mention of Program Review;	expectations include linking it all together (more specific look at an aspect of the College and whether it fits into the big picture to be effective as possible). 7. Lana: Agrees with all these suggestions

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	Danita & Lana said Terry Moore reviewed only French; Spanish, German and Sign Language were omitted from the review of Modern Languages; John sees Program Review as an opportunity to determine where Modern Languages should be placed within the College's organizational structure to avoid a department with only one full-time faculty member. • Carol: came from an auditing background-feels you are better prepared when an auditor comes; thus, it is important that we need to stress the purpose of Program Review throughout the College. • Mark: library is not perfect and there are things that can be improved on – when being audited was making sure he was within Compliance and he flagged some things that needed improvements – he tries to see things that could be improved – then it goes back to resources available • Danita: from A&D Division – did receive 2 substantive recommendations; one identified that A&D Division should have a statement that its staff have agree to keep confidentiality DANITA THEN PASSED OUT THE STATUS SHEET REGARDING PROGRAM REVIEWS COMPLETED OR IN PROCESS. 1.) LCFA Division have been given their external report and they have been submitting there	

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	response 2.) Assessment & Development Division has received Oral Exit Report and has made improvements/revisions based on recommendations. However, responses have not been correlated and/or stored in Follow-Up portion of database. 3.) ACcess Division has been completed due to Judy Johnson, Division Chair's retirement. Transfer of the Program Review database to the India Team resulted in a delay of about a year because it had to be revised. It is now complete. External Review Committees have completed reviews on the following divisions but the Oral Exit Reports must be held: Allied Health Division Business Division Finance and Administrative Services Division The following divisions are expected to submit their reports this semester: ITT Division - Dr. Shawn Fouts, Dean of CTE is completing the Self-Study for all departments at the East Campus ITS Division – status is unknown but it assumed that Lee Colaw, Chief Info. Officer is completing that Self-Study Continuing Education Division – completed and submitted Self-Study Enrollment Management Division – completed and it is	

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	receiving a final review by Robert Austin, VP of Student Affairs. Nursing Division granted a delay for another year due to submission of NCLEX program accreditation in the same year. • Danita: many people do not take Program Review as seriously as they do the other assessments. It requires effort. If not seen as critical, then AC will have some external entity(s) forcing additional requirements on it. If we don't find the things ourselves, someone else will. 3. Should any external entity reports (e.g. program accreditations, THECB required Program Reviews of AS, AA, AAS and AAT degrees and certificates) be justification for AC program to opt out of AC's Program Review process or at least first three steps of the process? • Danita: Co-Board has moved to emphasizing current programs with at least 5 graduates every year you can be placed into sunset: 1.) Safety & Environmental Health 2.) Real Estate (credit) – continuing education (CE) program will be continued • Also sunset, Substance Abuse Counseling and Travel and Tourism • All AAS and AS and Bachelor programs will be	

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	required to complete the THECB program review. It will have a prescribed review cycle. All Amarillo College programs under these degree programs will be reviewed in the same year. Currently, THECB has asked some colleges to serve as pilot institutions for this proposed program review. 4. What are other changes that you think should be made to AC's program Review and why? • Communication regarding what is expected of a Program Review External Review Committee needs to stronger. Explain and have samples of what a well-written recommendation is. Teach how to think critically and thus provide substantive recommendations as a result of Program Review. • Must distribute all External Review Committee reports – 3 divisions are still awaiting these reports due to the delay caused by re-build of Program Review database. Lana and Danita will set appts. for these divisions Oral Exit Reports. • Negative attitudes regarding Program Review because few implement improvements or revisions as a result of it. • Concern that it is time intensive and lacks transparency. Thus, Program Review results need to be published for anyone to see. (NOTE: Addition of 4th step in	

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	Program Review process is to heighten value by presenting the commendations, recommendations and improvements/revisions and budget ramifications to Cabinet.) • Mark: 2.5 Core Requirement regarding institutional effectiveness – could result in a warning; so don't make large changes now; if AC is deemed to making dramatic changes it could be viewed as being only in Partial Compliance; so better to have actions plan identified on what changes this Committee recommends for improving the Program Review process 5. Should AC risk making these changes during the SACSCOC reaffirmation of accreditation years or delay until after the off-side visit report? • Danita and Russell do not want to change until after the SACSCOC Off-Site Team reviews AC's Compliance Certification (August 2012 at the earliest). • Some discussion on if it would be seen as valuable to change the process now. • Lana – problem is attitude problem rather than a visibility one; employees don't understand significance of Program Review to AC and it is time intensive; requires reviewers to reflect on what is not being done; another problem is that the expectation to take it seriously comes from	

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	Assessment & Development Division (Danita's office) and many division have not taken ownership of their Program Review. • Mark: on the last Reaffirmation there was an assembly of those that wanted to here of what was found with recommendations and commendations where the Prog Reviews are filed and never seen again; Prog Review is Not Taken Seriously and it will not be seen. • John: Who should see this Program Review? • Carol: the department being reviewed because they are the ones that need to recognize what changes need to be made • Lana: the 4th step to add the presentation to the President's Cabinet will add visibility to Program Review. • Mark: It has to be exposed to the College community as a whole. Everyone needs to understand Program Review's significance.	
II. Other Business	Review for next meeting of the handouts and discussion from today's meeting Closing Question: Comments **What should we change regarding Program Review?**	Next meeting will discuss thoughts as result of Committee's discussion regarding the Program Review questions on the handout entitled "Today's Focus".

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
Next Meeting	One a month for the next 6 months	First Friday in March. An appointment will be sent to all members when the time and place is set. Will also set a meeting for first Friday in April.
Adjourn	Meeting adjourned 10:30 a.m.	