

## Institutional Effectiveness Committee March 4, 2011

Committee/Meeting Name	Institutional Effectiveness Committee				
Date	March 4, 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, John Gladstein, Mark Hanna, Bobbie Hyndman, Macy Kohler, Jodi Lindseth, Carol Bevel and Jeanetta Smiley				
Guests	Ruth Whitehead for Kerry Young				
Absent	Jon Bellah, Judy Massie, and Kerrie Young				

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenters:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
<b>I. Committee Charge</b>	<p>"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."</p>	
<b>II. 3 Major Planning and Assessments at AC</b>	<p>Introductions of all present</p> <p>Jodi: Explained the GEAR UP grant</p> <p>Danita: Announced, Kristin McDonald-Willey, will be joining the committee, as she will be the Assessments Coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessing the assessments or institutional effectiveness</li> <li>• How can we improve the assessment of</li> </ul>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p style="text-align: center;">Program Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We may need to meet once a month for the next 6 months</li> </ul>	
<p><b>III. Today's Focus – Program Review</b></p>	<p>A. Communicate significance of it: how?            B. Communicate examples of substantive recommendations and process for critical thinking and writing recommendations for it: Who? What?            C. Should accredited programs or those that complete THECB program review be allowed to substitute that for completion of AC's Program Review?            D. Published for all AC employees to view: Where?            E. Other Improvements/revisions?</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Should we make changes now or wait?</b>  <b>The 6 months will be used to determine this</b></p> <p>Danita: 'Communicate the difference.' People do not understand how important the Program Review is and the significance it can make.            We will need to provide examples on how to write the recommendations.</p> <p>Program Reviews require a solid self study, or this assessment doesn't work. Some program reviews have lacked a focus of making the program better and thus, the self-studies lack substantive answers and/or references which document the answers.            Maybe a lack of critical thinking when answering the self-study or the external review is the problem.</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>Also, external review committees lack knowledge on how to write recommendations. So, the IE Committee must determine what needs to be addressed to improve Program Review.</p> <p>The Non-Instructional Assessment Committee is a group that has been coaching non-instructional areas regarding the PET forms and outcomes. They have it down to an art. They have done so well with peer coaching on outcomes and PET forms that they asked if they could coach non-instructional areas on Program Review especially completion of self-study. That request evolved because Mark Hanna has done so well coaching some non-instructional divisions with how to input into the Program Review database and explaining Program Review Self-Study questions for clarity. The Non-Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee will review the questions on the Non-Instructional Self-Study for Program Review and recommend changes to ensure clarity and relevance.</p> <p>How can this IE Committee ensure that the Program Review rises to a higher level of value that all AC employees recognize its essence to AC's future? Currently, completed Program Reviews are published under Electronic Archives but should they be placed in a more prominent place on the AC website? Should there be other improvements besides content?</p> <p>Jeanetta: Amarillo College is always moving forward</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>and doing well. I worked with the accreditation in nursing and it is hard to do well, but something needs to be given to the college. How to get it on the radar screen-how can we increase the quality?</p> <p>Macy: I would like a response back in a reasonable amount of time; and good feedback.</p> <p>Bobbie: I agree, but also a lot of times that review is out there and we're just filling in the blanks and not held accountable. We need some type of numbers, such as number of graduates. Also, need the feedback. Plus, our programs and faculty/staff should be held accountable. The Program Review in CIS and the Advising Board, found we are not staying on top of what our employers need; critical thinking, simple thinking and problem solving skills.</p> <p>Danita: This is what we want to hear.</p> <p>Jodi: This is what we do every day, with GEAR UP. They are not specific every day, but with the college and with the consultant. We don't want to do all our objectives just to get numbers, but helps to keep us on line. Continually knowing where we are going, for the department, there are not always objectives; but the grant has objectives and we are held accountable. For AC departments/programs, that might help. Have to show some standards. This is a great transition time. We may need to create new standards, now.</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>Mark: Outcomes standards including graduation, change of status, from non-graduate to graduate, significance of a program should be determined by the outcomes of a program. That gets back to the effectiveness of what we are doing; we are changing people. If our programs are meeting outcomes, then that reflects on us that we are doing what we are supposed to do to make a difference. What are the outcomes of your program, not just grades, like graduate or employment numbers? How can we communicate that better? That's important, the more measures the better.</p> <p>Ruth: Our nursing dept has had a focus on looking at overall student success. Students are recognized early on. A student success consultant is checking study skills, whether the student is ready for the course, whether the classes are appropriate, what the classroom evaluation of the instructors indicates, what are trends based on comments from surveys, and what the GPA trend lines are. Students want to get out faster. The accreditation board has been pushing for us to get them out faster but we want them to be safe. Therefore, students enrolled in nursing programs you have to be prepared especially those who are enrolled in accelerated programs.</p> <p>Danita: GPA results? Doing things different? Is this more work? Is that what you are saying/</p> <p>Ruth: It's more than a conversation. It's not about</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>80% are A-B grade levels, but that they are credible and prepared for next level. We looked at revamping of our information regarding hand-washing and the way we record the students understanding of such content.</p> <p>Danita: Did you change the methodology for assessing their ability?</p> <p>Ruth: Yes. The first semester is already changing. They are more prepared now, more organized feeling by the student. It was a good shot in the arm and going in the right direction. It has not been easy, and it's very time consuming. Some of the measures having specific outcomes were those student evaluations and looking at whether we are meeting the needs now for our program. We need students that can think quickly and see big picture. We need resources and identify the students with these needs. It is encouraging that we can take care of their needs right away, with supplemental instruction. It's been good for the more difficult classes to have supplemental instruction, but still need more of the measures of the day to day process. It's a lot of little things. We have to get students out quicker. The first proposal for accelerated program was declined, but we were given recommendations. We sent another proposal for getting students through quicker. That's a good thing, and shaved off one semester.</p> <p>Mark: These checks on you were helpful, receiving</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>feedback, and you could see difference?</p> <p>Ruth: Yes. They were specific, it's going well. Students are going to find it a learning opportunity to get them through, already in the work place and want to complete the program.</p> <p>Danita: What she has talked about is on the radar screen for all areas. Thank you for your input, Ruth.</p> <p>Mark: This is the kind of thing that would give Program Review a shot in the arm. But we must be able to communicate the same level of value and significance to accepting recommendations from our Program Review process. Have to get this across to all our employees.</p> <p>Danita: If we can get the type of review that nursing completed for their program accreditation for every Program Review, it will achieve what I seek for all AC departments.</p> <p>Jodi: It's teaching people to shift from doing things from one way to a new way. Changing habits by getting into the process. We must ask ourselves where is AC going.</p> <p>Danita: It would be easier if Program Review had been that way from the beginning. Previously it was descriptive and just a check-off process. Now, it must be analytical and actually result in changes.</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>Danita: Financial effort is our biggest bat to change everything. Money is not in higher education, and very small amounts from feds. But accountability has grown.</p> <p>Those reviewers are being held accountable, then the public, what are we getting out of this? The skills are what the employer wants. We defend the grades, not the skills, rather we have their industry certificates or licensures have more weight than the degree.</p> <p>Ruth: One thing that we heard several people say, consultants and others, (getting to the point of what employers want) it's not re-teaching what they already know, if you need the review, make it short, and then go on.</p> <p>Dan: Know their skill level early; Co-board doesn't make them take the same semester information again. Losing some students fast. We are making them take the same things they learned in high school, is that why they are dropping out?</p> <p>Lana: Nursing is amazing. The assessment process, the co-board, concerned that there are amazing suggestions and they improved your program. Could we replace what we are doing? Co-board and our existing accountability and peer accountability, has no teeth. Now we have to write a narrative.</p> <p>Danita: In total agreement. We have to make it</p>	



**Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>functional.</p> <p>Lana: There is duplication without effort. Those that don't have external review, need teeth in the review. How do we make it value the process?</p> <p>Jodi: Adding an outcome objective. Something measurable, start small and get them in the process.</p> <p>Mark: That's part of the PET program-to get them integrated into the Program Review.</p> <p>Danita: It is there, back to the reviewer; how seriously do they take it? The questions are there but not at a level we are comfortable with.</p> <p>Carol: What kind of outcomes could you get from me? The writing ability for the follow-up-may not be a positive response; but need more than just negative responses. Help in this area is needed.</p> <p>Mark: If it's done like nursing's, maybe negative, but how you use the information, and then made to improve. Attitude is the thing. Reviewers are there to help them to improve, not to just knock them down.</p> <p>Lana: The teeth-had you not adhere to their instructions would you have lost your accreditation?</p> <p>Ruth: This was just a piece of a review. We had to</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>make changes, or we could not continue the program. We have to keep that piece of our program; there were no options. Students wanted the education. Our goal is to be efficient. For us we have to get students engaged, employers want our graduates. So we have to stay on top. We have implemented changes. Then we got the students that were marketable. It's what's getting us moving in that direction.</p> <p>Danita: That's the motivator.</p> <p>John: If nursing hadn't changed-then we go back to the teeth, would there be a punishment?</p> <p>Ruth: We were losing students that was punishing. And we were not going to receive the review needed for accreditation.</p> <p>Jodi: For us it is more of a positive. -We are suppose to improve this much, so we have to go back and make sure we are improving, keeping us on track. You have to focus on this, this, this, making sure you are staying on track and seeing the results.</p> <p>Judy: How do we get people to take Program Review seriously? I look to the employers to get the feedback. When it's time to do Program Review, the department/program submits so much for accreditations; they would prefer not to do a Program Review, but agree it needs to be done. Some have not heard a response from the Program</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>Review they turned in. I've made changes already, how can we get students in faster and how can we get these student do what the employer wants. We are doing well and my graduates have gotten jobs. I don't know if I write the review as you want it.</p> <p>Jodi: We need to remind people that a program reviewer doesn't always know what the program is trying to do.</p> <p>Judy: I couldn't understand the questions on the external review. It would have been better to meet face to face, which is not easy, but it would have been better because other reviewers did not understand the program.</p> <p>Danita: In past years, I have offered stipends to bring an external reviewer with the particular background or expertise. This person could have served as one of the members of the external review teams. Later, I removed these funds from the budget because no one took the offer for an outside of AC reviewer. Here we are back to the same questions as a decade ago.</p> <p>Jeanetta: How does the Program Review process work?</p> <p>Danita: There is a timeline. The Self-Study orientation is provided in October and is to be submitted by February 1. This year, only one Program Review was submitted on time. The External Review</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Mark: I make a motion that in order for results of Program Review to be presented to the Cabinet for action on budget and other actions they may want to make a two page summary of commendations, recommendations and budget ramifications may be substituted for those programs that have received program accreditations.</p> <p>Bobbie: Second</p> <p>Danita: All in favor.</p> <p>Motion Passed by all members present.</p>

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>Committee orientation is to start by Feb. 15<sup>th</sup> but must back up when a self-study is submitted late. The External Review Committee orientation is scheduled for that submitted self-study for Monday after Spring Break. Not exactly on time, but getting closer. Another Self-Study is "under final review" by the Cabinet member in that division. Two other self-studies have not been submitted and we don't know when they will be. When a self-study is submitted late, it causes the external review committee (which is now a maximum of 6 employees) to meet throughout summer months in order to complete the entire Program Review process within one year. This is our goal – complete entire process in one academic year.</p> <p>Danita: That brings us to the question of the programs accreditation. How do we get on these accredited programs on the radar screen as having completed program review? Submit a two page summary? Would that be what this committee desires??</p> <p>Mark: If people know they are going to present to the President's cabinet and their peers are going to see it, they will want to be proud about what is said.</p> <p>Carol: Is that done before the department has a chance to respond?</p> <p>Danita: No, after they get the recommendations. Then, it is analyzed again by the department.</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>What I'm concerned about is there are too few recommendations of substance or implementations resulting from program review process. We need to encourage them to focus on using recommendations to make improvements. Then the department can provide follow-up response as to what they see can or will done to make the improvements/revisions.</p> <p>Jeanetta: Do they go before the Cabinet and present the recommendations and what the plan is to complete the changes that were recommended?</p> <p>Danita: The person in charge of the department or division is the responsible for ensuring the presentation is done. He/she may bring others to assist with the presentation. The President's Cabinet presentation has not been done to date.</p> <p>Judy: Allied Health has been meeting and reviewing recommendations including those for Mortuary Science. What our leader says is the recommendations are to help us improve. What your leadership says holds impact.</p> <p>Macy: Dr. Kathy Wetzel made it significant. That is why we want to see the results.</p> <p>Danita: A lot of good has come from today's comments.</p> <p>Lana: Is that not going to apply to Music?</p>	

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
March 4, 2011**

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion, Information Presenters:</b>	<b>Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline</b>
	<p>Danita: It has to apply to all. There are some that are certified that are not accredited. That may cause some in the business area or other academic programs to seek accreditation when they haven't desired it before. Program accreditation adds value to programs in the eyes of employers.</p> <p>Carol: The business office goes through an audit annually? It is like an accreditation and a written report goes before AC's Board. Would that work to be taken instead of an accreditation?</p> <p>Danita: Give me the information as to what the auditors are looking at and we can share it here but recognize that this an AC audit, not just for business office. If you could share this information, we could make an informed decision. We do not want to duplication but we must have assessments by areas that are integrated, broad-based and systematic.</p> <p>Ruth: That is significant. It would save the institution money if they did not have to do the Program Review when a program is accredited.</p>	
<b>IV. Other Business</b>	No other business was presented.	
<b>Next Meeting</b>	Friday, April 4, 2011 9-10:30 am in L113	
<b>Adjourn</b>	Mark Hanna moved to adjourn the meeting John Gladstein seconded the motion	Meeting adjourned 10:30 a.m.

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**  
**March 4, 2011**