

Non-Instructional Annual Review Institutional Effectiveness

This document addresses the following SACSCOC requirements: CR 2.5, CS 3.3.1, and CS 3.5.1, CR 3.9.2, CR 3.13.3, and FR 4.5

Purpose

Amarillo College non-instructional areas consistently review data and strive for improvement. The purpose of this review is to demonstrate how AC non-instructional areas support AC's mission by "...enriching the lives of our students and our community."

On an annual basis, the Program Review process will capture a holistic snapshot of strengths, weaknesses, and improvement plans based on institutional data and assessment information.

The information collected on this form will also serve to help your division complete the information required by SACSCOC for Amarillo College's continued reaffirmation efforts.

Response Length Suggestion: Most responses should be 2-3 sentences. If available, you may also provide a link to other documentation that answers each question.

I: Identification

1. Department Title:

Institutional Effectiveness (IE Office)

2. Department Purpose Statement:

The primary purpose of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is to lead college-wide assessment efforts and provide the institution information that leads to improvement through outcomes, surveys, corresponding assessments, and data-based decision making (Updated Fall 2014).

3. Department Review Year (i.e. Most Recent Academic Year)

2013-2014 Year Review

4. Date of Submission:

7/22/2014

5. Lead Person Responsible for this Department Review:

Name: Kristin McDonald-Willey
Title: Director of Institutional Effectiveness
E-mail: kmw@actx.edu
Phone Number: 806-371-5420

6. Additional Individuals (Name and Title) Responsible for Completing this Department Review:

Danita McAnally, Chief of Planning & Advancement

II: Existing Data (Not Survey, Focus Groups, and/or Interviews)

AC staff/administrators collect and evaluate data related to people served.

1. What significant AC, state, federal, or other reports do you complete on an annual basis and/or what significant quantitative data do you collect or review on an annual basis?
(Please provide links to data/report information or a succinct summary of your data findings.)

1. [Assessment Reports](#) – A link to new reports will be available off of the new [Instructional and Non-Instructional review page](#), [Core Curriculum page](#), and the current [Strategic Plan page](#). However, these new reports have not yet been developed. Examples of past reports developed based on past assessment practices can be viewed on the [General Education Competency report page](#), [PET reports page](#), and [Program Review page](#).
2. [External Reports](#) – Reports to external stakeholders such as No Limits No Excuses (NLNE) are significant to the AC community. NLNE is focused on helping low-income adults attain higher education credentials and obtain a living wage job. One subcommittee is the NLNE Data Team which gathers data that the NLNE Core Team (decision makers) use to guide strategic planning for NLNE.
[Sample NLNE Reports](#)



Attachment -
External Reports - N



Attachment -
External Reports - N

3. [Institutional Reports](#) – Reports to institutional stakeholders such as the Dual Credit department are significant to the institutional department/community. In the instance of dual credit, schools have requested data to support the fulfillment of HB 5 initiatives.
[Sample DC Report](#)



Attachment -
[Institutional Report:](#)

2. Based on the past year's data (referenced in Question #1), please evaluate your data and/or department.
(Place an 'X' in each text box that corresponds to your evaluation. You may delete or add rows.)

Data Reported/Collected (Include Most Important Data)	Needs Improvement	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
1. Assessment Reports	X – New Reports	X- Old Reports	
2. External Reports	X		
3. Institutional Reports	X		

3. (If applicable) If any area “Needs Improvement,” please explain why (i.e. Analysis).

1. [Assessment Reports](#): 2013-2014 was a transitional year between old and new assessment practices/methodologies. For new reports, the Director of IE needs to closely review SACSCOC/THECB requirements and work with the Assessment Committee and other stakeholders to develop and present new reports in a way that is useful and meaningful to both outside agencies and to the institution.
2. [External Reports](#): Amarillo ISD recently underwent staff responsibility/structure

changes and the data team did not provide AISD adequate notice of an upcoming report deadline. As a result, AISD was unable to fulfill a critical role regarding AISD data. For this year, the Director of IE was selected to choose the data points to benchmark, to collect data for AISD, etc. However, the Office of IE is not in the best position to make choices, explain data points, etc. that relate to AISD data.

3. Institutional Reports: HB 5 data for all secondary schools within AC's service area (not just AISD) needs to be made available to the Dual Credit Coordinator. Also, based on subsequent meetings/clarifications with the Registrar and Associate Registrar, some tweaks need to be made to how dropped courses are figured into the report that is shared with external stakeholders.

4. (If applicable) Based on the data above, what changes do you recommend (i.e. Action Plan)?

Plan for 2014-2015

1. Assessment Reports:

- Create outline of new report formats – Summer 2014
- Share format with all individuals most likely to view/use that particular report and receive feedback regarding the format – Early Fall 2014
- Develop reports and once developed, seek approval/feedback from appropriate Assessment Committee – Ongoing
- Share reports with appropriate stakeholders - Ongoing

2. External Reports:

- Propose request to NLNE Data Team that a timeline of “due dates” be provided to anyone from whom the team requests feedback/data – Fall 2014

3. Institutional Reports:

- IT has worked with IE to create a revised query that can pull in more accurate information for DC schools. However, the Director of IE needs to learn to develop SPSS syntax that can quickly filter/organize the Business Objects data so that the DC success information (grades, enrollment/drops, etc.) can quickly develop accurate result tables for each DC school AC serves. – July/August 2014
- Send accurate school reports for all schools within AC's service area to DC coordinator – Fall 2014

Plan to Send More Accurate Reports



Attachment -
Institutional Report:

III: Existing Data (Based on Surveys, Focus Groups, and Interviews)

This Section Is Not Required for 13-14 Pilot Review

In this section, provide examples of ways you used survey data or qualitative research (interviews, focus groups, etc.) to make decisions.

PART A:

1. Over the past year, did your area collect and/or review any survey data or qualitative (focus group, interview, etc.) information?

(Place an 'X' in the text box that corresponds to your response.)

Yes (If Yes, Proceed to PART A, Question #2)	No (If No, Proceed to PART B)

2. Summarize the most important information that was collected and/or reviewed and the results.

--

3. (If applicable) Based on the data above, what changes do you recommend (i.e. Action Plan)?

--

PART B:

Additional Comments Related to Surveys and Qualitative Research (Not Required):

--

PART A –No Excuses:

Each department is expected to support student success initiatives.

- 1. List 1 or more ways your department most focuses on any of the No Excuses goals/initiatives.**

The IE Office seldom works directly with students, but we ensure the “successful completion of a degree, certificate, or transfer” by keeping AC compliant with SACSCOC (regional accreditor) requirements which allows AC to continue to operate as a public, non-for-profit institution that offers degrees. Additionally, this office supports all other No Excuses goals through data support and the collection of information related to No Excuses.

- 2. Are there any changes your department has made over this past year to remove barriers to students and further the No Excuses goals OR to move the needle toward fulfillment of the No Excuses goals?**

➤ If so, please explain.

➤ If not, but you plan to make changes that aid students success, please provide a few sentences explaining how you can better support No Excuses.

Yes. A few changes made by our department are as follows:

- 1) Lead Assessment Committee in an effort to simplify Annual Review/Outcome process so that it is easier for data to be evaluated and changes to be made that assist students
- 2) Increased support for student focus groups by not just participating in tallying student responses (e.g. First Year Seminar focus group assistance), but by also providing qualitative research information and guides for those leading focus groups (e.g. Chief of Communications and Marketing’s Focus Groups).
- 3) Expanded the data provided to areas such as dual credit in an effort to allow people to make improvements related to student success.

PART B –Institutional Outcomes:

Each department is expected to provide quality student, customer, and/or client services.

1. For this review year, what is/were your department's most important goals (i.e. broad things you would like to accomplish)?

Create a new institutional assessment process that is user friendly and fulfills external stakeholders' needs.

2. For this review year, what is/were your department's most important outcome/s that can be specifically measured and help you achieve your goals? Provide examples of 1-3 outcomes. (An outcome provides observable evidence that your student's or client's knowledge, skill, ability, attitude, or behavior has changed as a result of your efforts.)

1. Core Curriculum: Upon providing trainings to the Arts & Sciences department heads, program coordinators, and appointed faculty, 100% of the individuals who submit a core curriculum course proposal will meet compliance requirements for all THECB standards as evaluated by the appropriate Component Sub-Committee and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness through the use of the appropriate evaluation checklist. (In order to be 100% compliant, the department must fully understand THECB/AC core curriculum standards.)
2. Non-Instructional Annual Evaluation Plan: After attending a workshop offered by the Non-Instructional Assessment committee, all non-instructional departments will demonstrate an understanding of the review process by submitting a review that is 90% compliant with the criteria set forth by the committee.

3. How does your department assess the above outcome/s? What were the results of your outcome assessment? What do your results tell you?

1. Core Curriculum:
How Assessed: A checklist accompanied by the THECB core objective and component area descriptions, Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM), and related assessment materials was used by the committees to evaluate Part I of each form and by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness to evaluate Part II of each form. The most up-to-date 2014 submission and evaluation information can be viewed online, but the results are below:
Date of Result Evaluation: July 1, 2014
Total # of Courses Approved to Submit Plan: 120
Total # of Courses 100% Compliant: 103 (86%)

Analysis: 15 of the 17 courses that are currently not compliant have a proposal that was submitted by the same individual. The individual who submitted the 15 not approved courses will no longer be at AC in the fall semester and the Biology Department now also has an official department head. Overall, AC is running a little behind schedule in getting all courses 100% approved, but is on track to being ready to go by the Fall 2014 semester.

2. Non-Instructional Annual Evaluation Plan:

How Assessed: A checklist accompanied with materials developed by the Non-Instructional Assessment Committee will be used by various appointed members of the Committee to evaluate all non-instructional areas.

Total # of Plans Submitted: 32 of 38 (84%) (By Due Date)

Total # of Submitted Plans that Were 100% Compliant: 24 of 39 (62%) (By Due Date); 35 of 38 (92%) (Post Due Date)

Analysis: Though the feedback regarding the new plans has been mostly positive, there continues to be an issue with timely submission. Also, although the numbers above look promising, many departments fail to provide real data/results to support their statements and make improvements.

4. What change/s has your department made in the past year or do you plan to make based on your assessment of any outcome?

1. Core Curriculum:

- a. **Changes Made:** IT programmers received feedback and updated the core curriculum database to [a new database site](#) that will have better functionality for the user and will better pull information. The site will allow users to be sent a message that their proposal was not approved and will allow the user to be changed should a dept. chair/coordinator/appointed faculty member leave. This change should increase the number of people who submit the review in a timely fashion.
- b. **Planned Changes:** Based on the length of time it takes to update some courses, it is apparent that in the early fall semester the Director of IE will need to work with departments to make sure that they are implementing their assignment/assessment plans and collect the data. Also, strides need to be taken to ensure the plan is sustainable and that the Assessment Committee assists in creating an evaluation instrument that is as good as possible.

2. Non-Instructional Annual Evaluation Plan:

- a. **Changes to Process:** Discuss training/workshop improvements that can be made to encourage timely submission. Discuss what steps should be taken when departments do not submit their form and/or do not submit a form that shows quality (i.e. blatant disregard for process).
- b. **Changes to Form:** At the present time, no recommendations have been provided by the Non-Instructional Committee. The committee wants to keep the form simple. However, the bigger issue then is tackling how to make departments accept and use recommendations so that their information can be better tracked and improvements based on data can be made.

PART C –Strategic Planning:

Each department is expected to support AC's Strategic Planning initiatives.

1. Identify at least one strategy or task from the Strategic Plan your area currently addresses/evaluates.

- Strategy 1.1. "Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data." – In cooperation with the Assessment Committee, the Office of IE leads the training related to assessment and also the leads the tracking and evaluation of assessment data.
- Task 1.4.1. (and related tasks/subtasks) "Instructional leadership will ensure students completing any course will meet student learning outcomes." – In cooperation with the Assessment Committee, the Office of IE has led the institution in the new core curriculum process.

2. (If applicable) What additional item/s should AC's Strategic Plan address?

N/A – The AC employees the Office of IE works with consistently indicate that they have never read the Strategic Plan unless they are in the process of key word searching for this review. As a result, a rework of the strategic plan would make the review more search/user friendly and would likely promote an increased review of and interest in the strategic plan by AC employees.

PART D – Core Objectives (CR 2.10):

SACSOC guidelines require non-instructional areas to provide student support programs, services, and activities that are consistent with its mission and that promote student learning and enhance the development of its students.

At Amarillo College, a component of student learning is found present in the existence of AC's General Education Competencies. Due to recent mandate changes set forth by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), AC has adopted the following General Education Competencies: Communication Skills, Critical Thinking Skills, Empirical and Quantitative Skills, Teamwork, Social Responsibility, and Personal Responsibility.

Although these competencies obviously relate to academia, many non-instructional areas also support some or all of these objectives.

Some Examples of Ways Non-Instructional Areas Can Support Student Learning:

Personal Responsibility: Any service that provides materials/information related to financial literacy, life planning, etc. to students could relate to personal responsibility. Also any measure of student personal responsibility (e.g. percent of students not dropped for non-pay, percent of students who pay their rent to AC housing on time, etc.) relates to this topic.

Social Responsibility: If students are able to serve or learn about ways to serve their community or world, this could relate to social responsibility.

Communication, Critical Thinking, and Empirical and Quantitative Skills: If a department teaches a skill/topic within the classroom or through a published document geared toward students, this skill/topic could relate to communication, critical thinking, or any of the other objectives—depending on the skill/topic being taught.

Teamwork: Any student organization/framework where students must work successfully within a group could equate to teamwork.

1. Does your area work (in-person, through publications, or through some other means) with students to learn/accomplish any of the following objectives?

Objective	Yes (If Yes to Any Area, Respond and Proceed to Part D, Question #2)	No (If No to All Areas, Proceed to Part D, Question #3)
Communication Skills	X	
Critical Thinking Skills	X	
Empirical & Quantitative Skills	X	
Teamwork	X	
Personal Responsibility	X	
Social Responsibility	X	
Technology	X	

2. For each objective that received a “Yes” response, provide a bulleted list identifying how your department addresses each particular objective with AC students, any assessments related to your objective (if applicable), and any results related to your assessment (if applicable).

- Assessments can be indirect (e.g. surveys, focus groups, etc.) or [direct](#).

- Direct Assessment – Lead in the use of checklists to assure direct assessment occurs (when appropriate) in Instructional and Non-Instructional areas. Reports with an explanation of how objectives are measured and results will be linked off the [Core Curriculum](#) and [Instructional and Non-Instructional Review page](#).
- Surveys – Results specific to general education will be provided on the [survey page](#).
- Focus Groups – Assist with focus groups (e.g. FYS, Communications, etc.) as needed. The focus group results are compiled by Lana Jackson, QEP director and are presented by her department in their own review/QEP documentation.
- Rubric Evaluation – Assist with evaluating rubrics as needed (e.g. FYS, English, etc.). Again, these results are housed in the department office completing the assessment.

3. Please indicate (place an X in the corresponding box/es) the mode of delivery by which you offer any support programs, services, and activities, to students.

In Person	Web	Phone	E-mail	Live Chat
X			X	

4. Do you have plans to expand your learning objectives and/or modes of delivery? If so, how do you plan to expand these objectives/delivery modes? If not, why not?

STUDENTS: I currently work with students in-person via focus groups. I also conduct Class Climate surveys that are sent out via email. At this time, the Office of IE has no other plans to expand the learning objectives/modes of delivery to students since this offices does not typically work directly with students. However, this office is available to support students as requested/needed.

FACULTY/STAFF (Relates to Students): It's been requested that the Director of IE develop pre-recorded trainings and/or documents that walk through various processes for faculty/staff (which relate to student assessment) so this mode of delivery will be explored for the 2014-2015 year.

V: Policies and Procedures

This Section Is Not Required for 13-14 Pilot Review

Amarillo College's non-instructional areas consistently have procedures in place that promote student confidentiality, staff efficiency, student success, and accountability.

Each non-instructional area will respond to the Core 5 (first 5) "Policies and Procedures" questions if they are pertinent to their area. If a department has additional questions they would like to include for accountability or some other purpose, they will also include those questions on this section of the form.

1. Please explain how your area supports the security, confidentiality, and integrity of student records and maintains special security measures to protect and back up data (CR 3.9.2)

2. How do you ensure that all of your employees are aware of student complaint procedures and that the procedures are handled in a way that is in accordance with the institutional policy of complaint procedures being reasonable, fairly administered, and well-publicized (CR 3.13.3)?

3. Has your area made any departmental changes based on student complaints? If so, what changes did you make (FR 4.5)?

4. Have you addressed any local, state, audit, or federal compliance issues that have caused you to make an adjustment to your department and/or a policy change? If so, please explain.

5. Have you made any changes to your department's policy or procedures over the past year that are otherwise not addressed in this review? If so, please explain.

VI: Conclusions

1. What is the biggest issue/obstacle that your department currently faces?

Please explain the issue, point to evidence supporting why your issue is important (addressed in this document or elsewhere), explain how you would like to fix the issue, and explain any budgetary constraints.

The biggest issue that the Office of IE currently faces is choosing the right path that will take AC through the next reaffirmation cycle in regard to assessment practices and software.

- With a recent change in presidential leadership and with Academic Affairs leadership changes to come, the direction AC takes with assessment will likely be guided by some of the individuals in the new leadership roles. Also, bringing in Blackboard software may eventually affect the use of paper-based systems (e.g. this review), Web-based systems (e.g. the Core Curriculum database), and use of other software systems (e.g. WIDS) so there are many variables that need to be considered and explored before AC moves forward.
- AC also currently requires core curriculum assessment on a small scale for core curriculum courses, but may need to expand that so it is clearly not just one assignment that addresses the core and/or so courses outside of the core also regularly assess outcomes.

Fix the Issue: Meet with the new leadership team and Assessment Committee to decide on a best course of action during the 2014-2015 year.

Budgetary Constraints: Man hours/man power will definitely be a constraint. The panel at Blackboard World who use Blackboards Assessment software had many people assist with the assessment process and they said the process was time consuming. Thus, the Director of IE will need to partner with IT, CTL, Academic Affairs, and non-instructional areas to decide a best course of action and to move forward with new assessment practices.

2. Additional Comments Pertinent to this Annual Review Evaluation (Not Required):

N/A