

PET FORM
Planning and Evaluation Tracking
(2012-2013 Assessment Period)

Division of: Planning and Advancement (Formerly Assessment and Development)

Department of: Institutional Research

Person Responsible for this Division: Danita McAnally

People Responsible for this Form: Jessica Smith, Jon Bellah and Melanie Castro

Purpose Statement (With Last Updated Date):

Create a culture for continuous improvement at Amarillo College (last reviewed fall 2011).

Goal Statement #1 (Institutional Research):

Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).

1. Outcome/Objective Statement

(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):

As a result of data provided by Institutional Research (IR) for No Excuses and other institutional needs (e.g. IDS and SSDS, predictive modeling), 70% of AC employees who complete the AtD annual survey will indicate a satisfaction level of either a 4 or 5 (1-5 scale with 1 = low and 5 = high) with the collection, analysis and reporting of longitudinal data for the No Excuses cohort.

AtD Annual Survey: Question 2.2a College routinely collects, analyzes and reports longitudinal data on cohorts of students to chart student progression and outcomes. IR will provide the data to the appropriate individuals and these individuals will analyze the data to make better decisions. (New Outcome Based on AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Task 1.1.1.1 and No Excuses. Note: While new, this outcome is a rewrite of the 2011-2012 PET form Outcome 3B. The outcome was revised to fit the most pressing survey needs and improvements related to institutional issues).

• Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

N/A – New Outcome

No results will be available until spring 2013

• Analysis

N/A – New Outcome

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis

(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

• Improvements

N/A – New Outcome

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2010-2011** PET Results:
- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:
- Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):

• Recommendations/Actions for **2012-2013**

- Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):

Director of IR and Chief of Planning and Advancement will take the lead.

- Action Plan:

Await survey results. If a 3 or lower is scored in any of the areas of collection, analysis, or reporting, IR will partner with No Excuses Data Team and Core Team to form an action plan of how to better collect, evaluate, and/or distribute AtD data.

- Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):
Planned implementation – By fall 2013
- Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):
Not Applicable – There are no significant budgetary needs for future assessment actions.

2. Outcome/Objective Statement

(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):

After analyzing institutional, community, and national data, the Office of IR will create an annual Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Report that will identify departmental level data components that signify a healthy or unhealthy program. Upon the report's completion, the data will then be presented to the president's office and President's Cabinet so that informed interventions and decisions can be made. As a result of these meetings, the President's Cabinet will make at least one improvement or improvement plan per year. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Task 1.3.1. This outcome corresponds to Outcome 3C on the 2011-2012 PET Form).

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis

(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

This outcome has essentially been discontinued. The IR office was able to pull KPI data for each program. The pulled data included a Faculty Workload Analysis (FWA), Kansas Study results, Licensure data, Perkins data, Enrollment Demographics, Graduate and Transfer Data, Persistence Data, and Survey data for each program. However, by the time all of this data was compiled into one place, the data was already outdated and some of the data (for technical programs) pulling efforts were duplicated by THECB efforts.

The data issues varied. A change in workforce was one contributing factor because the Director of IR and IE and a Research Assistant left during the compiling of data. There were also some data integrity issues from when one group of people would work on the data and another person/group of people would work on the data in a slightly different way. However, the main issue was that this whole process was just too time consuming for the amount of man power and the project load currently on hand and that a different process needed to be pursued.

- Improvements

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2010-2011** PET Results:
Through this process, IR and IE were able to identify the Databook tables that most need to be maintained and updated and correlated with the Program Review process. Although the names may be changed, Databook Table 1A provides fall enrollment data, Table 2K provides retention data, Table 8A provides the number of awards. Additionally, the Databook does contain or could contain information that is really more important from a program review standpoint such as Table 2G (A-C pass rates) and transfer rate data. The updating of the Databook has begun with an increased focus on the most needed tables.
- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful: From a short-term view, this was not successful because the KPI was never actually delivered and a very large number of hours by a lot of people was spent working on this endeavor. However, from a long-term standpoint this was successful because it really caused the IR and IE office to evaluate what data is really "need to know" versus "nice to know" and how this data can best be distributed to those who need the data.

- Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details): **N/A – No significant budgetary considerations.**
- **Recommendations/Actions for 2012-2013**
 - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):
Director of IR and Chief of Planning and Advancement will take the lead.
 - Action Plan:
 - 1) A report (IDS) will be created that includes the following variables: enrollment, faculty workload analysis, cost, NCCBP data, graduates, transfers, retention, outcomes assessment, CCSSE variables, areas for potential growth, areas showing a declining trend that may signify an “at risk” program, overall dashboard, overall college trend compared to department trend, demographics of those enrolling, and a look into the job market analysis.**
 - 2) IR will ask departments to report on important findings and how they used the data and what they still lack or need from IR in order to improve the usefulness of the report each year.**
 - 3.) Key Performance Indicators was determined to be an ineffective use of IR staff time. Instead, IR staff will plan to update Databook tables that contain much of the same information as the KPI on a regular basis. Additionally, IR and IE staff will pursue innovative ways to disperse other data previously included on the KPI (e.g. FWA, Perkins data, etc.)**
 - 4) Discontinue – This action plan will no longer be evaluated on the PET form.**
 - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):
Planned implementation of updated Databook tables – Fall 2013
 - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):
Not Applicable – No significant budgetary considerations.

3. Outcome/Objective Statement

(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):

IR will create an IR database (log of all requests for data), research project proposal form, and standard IR report that will streamline the requests for data (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Task 1.1.1.1. This outcome corresponds to Outcome 3D on the 2011-2012 PET Form).

- **Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)**
At this point the prototype for the IR Request Database has been developed, but it is still in the early testing stages and needs much updating.
- **Analysis**
 - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis
(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
The India Team has done a great job providing the framework for the IR database. However, the database could still be more user friendly and has some bugs that need to be fixed prior to mass distribution.
- **Improvements**
 - List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2010-2011** PET Results:
The fields for the IR database have been created, but there are currently major issues on both the submission/retrieval side that need to be addressed before the product is beta tested.

- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:
Successful – Although it is not ready to roll out, IR is much closer to streamlining and effectively recording/managing all data requests.
- Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details): **N/A – Improvements are being made by existing staff.**
- Recommendations/Actions for 2012-2013
 - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):
Director of IR and Research Associate
 - Action Plan:
 - 1. IR Request database will be refined by India Team under the leadership of Research Associate.**
 - 2. IR staff will pilot test and make revisions.**
 - 3. Planning and Advancement staff and additional Institutional staff will pilot and then IR Request Database will be rolled out to the College community.**
 - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):
Planned implementation – By fall 2013
 - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):
No additional cost for this effort than already is budgeted for personnel.

Goal Statement #2 (Institutional Research):

Support college and career readiness. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 3.2. Note: This goal and the subsequent outcome represent a more accurate link to the strategic plan and a revised, more specific outcome than was presented on the 2011-2012 PET form by Goal 4 and Outcome 4A).

1. Outcome/Objective Statement

(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):

After Cabinet members determine the primary predictive study that is needed for the upcoming year, IR will complete at least that one predictive study and share it with College constituencies.

- 1) IR staff in cooperation with developmental education leadership will identify gaps in the college readiness of first-time in college students based on TSI scores and local area school district (high school) data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015 Strategy 3.2.1.1)**

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

N/A – New Outcome

- Analysis

- Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis
 (Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
N/A – New Outcome

- Improvements

- **N/A – New Outcome**

- List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2010-2011** PET Results:
- Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:
- Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):

- Recommendations/Actions for **2012-2013**

- Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):
Director of IR or Senior Research Analyst will be the lead
 - Action Plan:
 - 1. Work with appropriate Developmental Education and Student Affairs staff to ensure all key variables are identified.**
 - 2. Develop this study in summer 2013**
 - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):
Planned implementation – By fall 2013
 - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):
Not Applicable – There are no additional budgetary needs for these actions.
-