**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) |

1. **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). |

1. **Department Review Year (i.e. Most Recent Academic Year)**

|  |
| --- |
| 2014-2015 Review Year |

1. **Date of Submission:**

|  |
| --- |
| 8/1/2015 |

1. **Lead Person Responsible for this Department Review:**

|  |
| --- |
| Name: Kristin McDonald-Willey  Title: Director of Institutional Effectiveness  E-mail: [kmw@actx.edu](mailto:kmw@actx.edu)  Phone Number: 806-371-5420 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

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.)**

|  |
| --- |
| I am scheduled to begin assisting with more state reports in the future related to the THECB inventory database and workforce, but for the time being I work on the following reports:  1) **Assessment Reports –** Links to past reports may be found in the [Library Archives](https://www.actx.edu/archives/pagesmith/34) or off the various pages linked from the [Assessment Home page](https://www.actx.edu/ie/pagesmith/21). Reports with which I’ve assisted include instructional/non-instructional reports (PET forms, program review, and now these annual reports), strategic plan reports, general education/core curriculum reports, and other related assessment reports. Sample Report: [2013-2014 Non-Instructional Report.](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/541)  2) **External Reports** – Reports to 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 to submit to the NLNE Core Team (decision makers) to guide strategic planning for NLNE.  Sample NLNE Report:    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 fulfill the HB 5 initiative. I regularly produce many reports each month, but for the purposes of this document, I will provide an example to a DC document.  Sample DC Report |

1. **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 |  |
| 2. External Reports |  | X |  |
| 3. Institutional Reports |  | X |  |

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

|  |
| --- |
| N/A – No area marked as “Needs Improvement” |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Overall, the reporting is provided pretty seamlessly. However, there’s always room for improvement.  1. Assessment Reports: Getting enough committee members together so that the results can be complied and distributed to instructional/non-instructional employees continues to be a challenge and as a result, the report is not compiled and shared as early as it could be. IE should continue to seek ways to review responses and disseminate data in a more timely fashion.  2. External Reports and Institutional Reports: Getting “clean” data continues to be an issue in tabulating data that can be trusted and is reliable. I would benefit AC staff to gather more purposefully to discuss the data. For example, I have been in discussions with IT, IR, and Registrar this year with issues related to a student’s end date which skews current major enrollment tabulations. |

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

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)** |
| X |  |

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

|  |
| --- |
| We collected data for the Graduating Student Survey via Class Climate, but in doing so found that we have a real issue related to both data validity and return rate.  Within the past few years the Registrar’s Office moved to an automatic graduating procedure which greatly helps our students and raises our completion rates. However, in doing so, it removed the in-between process where students would register for graduation and take this survey as a part of that graduation process.  Prior to our moving to Class Climate-based graduating student survey methods, AC’s return rate was almost 100% and we regularly rated as “good” or higher in every category. Also, as part of that process, the survey ran through Colleague and the student ID was linked to their responses so we were able to easily and with accuracy determine which majors gave which responses so we could provide departmental results.  After moving to the survey option not linked to Colleague, the response rates have plummeted (under 10% for many divisions), are largely negative responses, and it is very difficult to get down to program-level results with ensure accuracy. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Unless we can think of a more creative way to get divisions, department, and program-level results, it might be best to eliminate the surveys by division that contain logic trees asking students to identify their major and to instead just go to one survey that has one active link.  If we go the one survey route, we could send students the link, but could also possibly provide the link to students at other locations (such as Graduation, picking up their diploma, etc.) to hopefully capture more student responses. The downside is that we would not be able to provide broken down results and we need to look into the possibility as to whether or not students could take the survey multiple times. |

PART B:

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

IV: Institutional Initiatives

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.  We also regularly support all institutional initiatives and committees related to student success. |

1. **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| I have participated in leading focus groups related to the strategic plan. |

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)?**

|  |
| --- |
| Lead institutional effectiveness processes which prove outcome obtainment. |

1. **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.)

|  |
| --- |
| For the previous year, my focus was on the new core curriculum implementation and non-instructional outcomes so this year’s focus is on the core curriculum assessment and instructional program outcomes.  1. Core Curriculum: After providing trainings to the Arts & Sciences department heads, program coordinators, and appointed faculty, 80% of the courses that were approved for core curriculum approval will meet the compliance requirements for the THECB as evaluated by the appropriate evaluation checklist.  2. Instructional Assessment: After receiving training on the new annual review process, 80% of instructional programs will submit a review that is compliant as designated by the criteria set forth by the academic deans and instructional review committee. |

1. **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: The benchmark was not met. Out of 126 courses approved for the core, less than 50% of the courses met each expectation.    Areas Meeting 80% Benchmark in Most Areas:   * Core 10 (3 courses): Communication – 100% met in all areas * Core 50 (17 courses): Creative Arts – 88% met in most areas; only area below at 65% met is analysis/action plan * Core 60 (2 courses): American History – 100% met in all areas * Core 70 (2 courses): Political Science/Government – 100% met in all areas * Core 80 (19 courses): Social and Behavioral Sciences – 84% met in all areas   Areas Not Meeting 80% Benchmark in Most Areas:   * Core 20 (9 courses): Mathematics – 0% All areas (Did not submit) * Core 30 (36 courses): Life & Physical Sciences – 14-19% (Most did not submit) * Core 40 (23 courses): Language, Philosophy, & Culture – 52-57% (Many did not submit) * Core 90 (15 courses): Institutional Option – 20% Met (FYS and Speech met; all labs did not submit)   There is room for improvement in most foundational areas, but STEM appears to need the most assistance in this area.  I think the issue is two-fold one is that despite the multi-year planning for how courses would meet the [core curriculum requirements](https://www.actx.edu/courseproposal/) and [the evaluation](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/491) ensuring their assignment/assessment plan was in alignment with THECB objectives, many of the courses were still not prepare for the actual collection, management, and reporting of all this data. On the flip side, these are also a lot of courses for IE to manage with any kind of software system so more time was spent one-on-one with trainings requested by others than by seeking out training opportunities with those who did not submit.  2. Instructional Assessment: The benchmark was not met. Out of 56 areas that were requested to submit forms, only between 64-77% met the expectations.    Areas Meeting 80% Benchmark in Most Areas:   * Academic Success (4 Areas) – 75%-100% Met All Expectations * Health Sciences (15 Areas) – 80%-100% Met All Expectations * Liberal Arts (16 Areas) – 81% Submitted and Provided Outcome Data; only 75% had improvement plan * Nursing (2 Areas) – 100% Met All Expectations   Areas Not Meeting 80% Benchmark in Most Areas:   * STEM (11 Areas) – 45% Met All Expectations (Note: Many Did Not Submit) * Technical Education (8 Areas) – 24% - 50% of All Expectations Met (Note: Many Did Not Submit)   STEM and Technical Education need the most assistance in this area.  Just like with the non-instructional review during the 2013-2014 year, the primary focus for instructional areas this 2014-2015 year was on forming outcomes, providing results/analysis to evaluate outcome, and then forming improvement plans based off the results. What instructional programs were asked to do was in truth not much different than what they’ve been asked to do in previous years with [PET forms](https://www.actx.edu/archives/pagesmith/41).  Any time you move to a new form and/or have other new initiatives going on at the same time (e.g. the core curriculum implementation/assessment), it’s easy to see how programs may become overwhelmed. |

1. **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: If response rate does not improve the following year, consider going to a rotation cycle with courses so that more time can be spent seeking out materials from previous non-responders.  2. Instructional Assessment: With the Blackboard (Bb) pilot coming up, make sure that an area such as math included so that we can assist them in getting core curriculum and/or program outcome results. |

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. | |

1. **(If applicable) What additional item/s should AC’s Strategic Plan address?**

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

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 |  |

1. **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](http://www.actx.edu/iea/filecabinet/425).

|  |
| --- |
| • 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](http://www.actx.edu/ie/index.php?module=article&id=103) and [Instructional and Non-Instructional Review page](http://www.actx.edu/ie/index.php?module=article&id=108).  • Surveys – Results specific to general education will be provided on the [survey page](http://www.actx.edu/ie/index.php?module=article&id=61).  • 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. |

1. **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 2015-2016 year. This was a consideration for 2014-2015, but I attended many division and department-specific meetings that year where I presented information in-person so this consideration has been temporarily tabled. |

V: Policies and Procedures

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)**

|  |
| --- |
| All FERPA regulations are followed. Student information is not shared except in a redacted and/or complied manner so that a student’s individual identity is anonymous. |

1. **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)?**

|  |
| --- |
| N/A- I do not have employees. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| No |

1. **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| SACS-COC now required [student achievement information](https://www.actx.edu/ie/pagesmith/4) to appear online so a Web page has been developed for this purpose and the link has been shared with SACS-COC. |

1. **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| We have undergone quite a few changes to address THECB core curriculum requirements. We are not currently compliant, but I expect we will need to continue to refine/revise our processes. |

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.**

|  |
| --- |
| Issue  The biggest issue/obstacle I currently face is process/initiative management. We currently have many projects underway and many new projects scheduled to start in the near future. Figuring out how to manage all the work without the assistance of workflow or software has proven to be a challenge. Although we will move to Bb Assessment which will help with document storage, many schools such as Odessa College have a full-time person devoted to managing the assessment processes through Bb; whereas, we do not.  Evidence  As cited in the outcomes portion of this document, many areas are not submitting forms and STEM and Technical Education, in particular, need more assistance in order for AC to meet its outcome goals.  Fix Issue  Over the next few years, a cycle needs to be created and/or sampling put in place so that every area does not need to submit everything all of the time. More changes are coming to our assessment processes so we also need to consistently do and request one thing leading up to the 5th year review. We’ve changed our process virtually every year since the decennial review and while we’re evolving which is a good thing, the inconsistency has caused confusion related to expectations.  Budgetary  If we move to a sample/cycle, there would not be any budgetary expectations. However, bringing in more assistance and/or offering faculty a stipend would definitely have strong ramifications. |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |